

68

A  
SOBER and TEMPERATE  
**DISCOURSE,**  
Concerning the Interest of  
**Words in Prayer.**  
The just Antiquity and Pedigree of  
**LITURGIES,**  
O-R.

Forms of Prayer in Churches :  
With a View of the State of the Church, when they  
were first composed, or imposed.

*Together with*

A Discovery of the weakness of the grounds upon which they were first brought in, or upon which Bishop *Gawden* hath lately Discoursed, the necessity of a *Liturgy*, or the inconveniency of altering the *English Liturgie*, the utility of *Church Musick*, and the lawfulness of *Ceremonies* : in which are mixed *Reasons* justifying those Godly *Ministers*, who forbear the use of the *Common-Prayer*, against the late *Out-cries* of the said *Bishop*.

---

By H. D. M. A.

---

*Henry Daulberry*

---

1 Pet. 3. 9. *Not rendering evil for evil, or, railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you should inherit a blessing.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. A. and are to be sold at the Royal Exchange, & in *Pauls Church-yard*, 1661.



**H**E ( who had reported to Master *Williams*, *Whittingham*, *Gilby*, and others, that *Cranmer*, Bishop of *Canterbury*, had drawn up a Book of *Prayer*, *an hundred times more perfect than this* that we now have; the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a *wicked Clergy* and *Convocation*, with other *Enemies*) even he, I say, stood in this, that Master *Bullinger* did like well of the *English Order*, and had it in his *Study*. But when *Whittingham* had demanded that question, *Bullinger* told him, that indeed Master *H.* and Master *C.* asked his judgement concerning certain points of that Book, as *Surplice*, *Private Baptism*, *Churching of Women*, the *Ring in Marriage*, with such like, which (as he said) he allowed not, and that *he neither could if he would*, *neither would if he might* use the same in his *Church*, whatsoever had been reported. *History of the troubles at Frankeford first published 1575 in the 42.43. pag.*



68

A  
SOBER and TEMPERATE  
**DISCOURSE,**  
Concerning the Interest of  
**Words in Prayer.**  
The just Antiquity and Pedigree of  
**LITURGIES,**  
O-R.

Forms of Prayer in Churches :  
With a View of the State of the Church, when they  
were first composed, or imposed.

*Together with*

A Discovery of the weakness of the grounds upon which they were first brought in, or upon which Bishop *Gauden* hath lately Discoursed, the necessity of a *Liturgy*, or the inconveniency of altering the *English Liturgie*, the utility of Church *Musick*, and the lawfulness of *Ceremonies* : in which are mixed *Reasons* justifying those Godly *Ministers*, who forbear the use of the *Common-Prayer*, against the late *Out-cries* of the said *Bishop*.

---

By H. D. M. A.

---

*Henry Dalgely*

---

1 Pet. 3. 9. *Not rendring evil for evil, or, railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you should inherit a blessing.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for W. A. and are to be sold at the Royal Exchange, & in Pauls Church-yard, 1661.

FOR THE YEAR 1860

# DISCOUNT

ON THE

## WORLD

AND

## PEOPLE

OF THE

## UNION

AND

## THE

OF THE

## WORLD

AND

## PEOPLE

OF THE

## UNION



# A Discourse of Liturgies, or Forms of Prayer in Churches, &c.

## CHAP. I.

*The Interest of Words in Prayer considered, both as to private and publick Prayer; The Necessity of them considered, as the Homage of our Lips, as they restrain mentall extravagancies, and are Interpreters of our Conceptions to others: Consequences from this Consideration.*

I. **S**O transcendent is the privilege of coming to the Holy of Holies, by the new and living way in the most sublime and spiritual duty of Prayer, where the soul talks with its Creator, as it were, face to face. Such is the nature of that spiritual performance, considered in it self, so momentous the Concerns, for which in it we wait upon the Throne of Grace; so many the directions which our Holy Father hath given us in his Word for the acceptable performance of it, that we must needs be concluded *unthankful to God*, who hath indulged so glorious a Liberty to us, *unjust and unreasonable to our selves*, who are by the Law of Nature taught to remit or intend our minds in all performances, according to the moment of them, and *unfaithful to that Word*, which we own as the square of all our Conversations, if we should not warily attend our Souls in so Sacred an

## A Discourse of Liturgies;

Homage, in which so much of our Interest lies, not offering a Female; when we have a Male in our flock; though we knew of no such Male-diction as that, *Cursed be he that doth the work of the Lord negligently.*

II. Whilst we view this sacred thing Prayer, as our Privilege, we can consider it no otherwise than as a Liberty, to ask of the Father of mercies, what we or others stand in need of, under the encouragements of many precious Promises, not short of his who said, *Ask what thou wilt, even to the half of my Kingdom, I will give it thee*; yea, far beyond; for the Lord will give Grace and Glory, *Ps. 84.* When we respect it as our duty, we find it is expressed in Scripture under the many notions of *Seeking God, Calling upon him, wrestling with him, pouring out our souls before him, &c.* As our view of it in the notion of a privilege, forbids us any limitations, as to the matter of our Prayers, other than what God hath set us; so the latter obligeth us to a performance of it under such Circumstances, as shall neither divert the intention of our mind, nor cool the fervour of our Spirits, which two things are most essentially necessary to the acceptable performance of our duty in it, and so excellently becomes that most sacred performance; and without which our performance is but *lip-labour*, and *lost labour*; yea, no other than a most gross Hypocrisy, and mocking of him who cannot be mocked.

III. Prayer being the souls *Colloquy with God*, who is a Spirit, and our Tongue (which is the Organ of speech) with all the faculty belonging to it, and the issues of it, serving chiefly (if not only) for intercourse with men (Spirits having another way to communicate their sense each to other) It is rationally apparent that there is no absolute necessity of any words at all in Prayer. (*Hannah* can pray acceptably, and yet her voice not be heard, *1 Sam. 1.*) for such necessity must either be on the Souls part, or on Gods: On the Souls part they are not necessary; for it can long and desire without the Tongue; nor yet on Gods part are they so, for he not only knows what things we have need of, but also what we would have before we ask them; how else can he answer before we call, and (as he promiseth) *hear before we speak?*

IV. But he who made all things for himself; did not in that general design except the Tongue of man, which being his creature, is naturally obliged, and ex-Instituto, is otherwise obliged to his Service, and as his Word hath directed its Service in other things, so also in the duty of Prayer, commanding us to *take unto us words, and say, &c.* And calling to his Spouse, *Let me hear thy voice, for it is comely*; And his Providence hath for this end (amongst others) disposed reasonable souls into humane bodies, that they should animate the tongues of men to this sacred Service: Besides that, experience teacheth the Sons of men that

that the use of the *lively voice* is of excellent use to fix the mind, and to restrain that wild thing from such wanton diversions, as it is most prone to, in its exercises upon God: Whence it is that there is not only *Mental*, but *Vocal* Prayer, & both the unquestionable duty of Christians; and an use of words in Prayer is, if not at all times, yet at some times, and for all Christians, necessary by a necessity of Precept, & highly expedient generally even in the Souls *privatist* converses with God.

V. But in *Publick* Prayer, the use of words is most unquestionably necessary. God hath not only allowed us a liberty to pray for our selves, and in our *Closets*, but also to pray one with and for another, and also enjoined us it as our duty, and encouraged us to it by many gracious Promises. It is his *revealed Will*, that in such publick devotions, some particular persons should be the mouth of the rest unto him, whose Prayer (according to divine Institution) is made the common performance of the whole Society (whether it be that of a whole Family, or that of a greater or lesser Congregation) by their concurrence in spirit with him that speaketh, and their rational and fiducial assent to what he speaketh, as well on theirs, as his own behalf. Now there being no other ordinary way of correspondence which God hath allowed rational souls each with other (in their united estate) but by the tongues of men, animated by the souls to that very purpose, that they might be their Interpreters. It is impossible that publick Prayer should be performed without words, and those both audibly and intelligibly pronounced, which is also conformable to the Will of God, who hath taught us when we pray, to say, *Our Father*: Whence it appears, that both the silent, mute Meetings of *Quakers*, and the *Latine Service* of *Papists*, and the Prayers of any others said or sung, so that People cannot hear or understand what is said, are all of them abominable in the sight of God, and to be abhorred of every reasonable Christian.

VI. But seeing words are no more than the desires of our souls interpreted. And there being no further use of them in the duty of Prayer, than that by them we might sacrifice unto God the devotion of our hearts by the calves of our lips. 2. And by the help of them we might interpret the (otherwise not intelligible) desires of our souls unto others. And 3. Restrain the extravagancies of our own Spirits: A Curiosity of Phrase in Prayer, seems neither necessary nor reasonable. Not necessary, because as our holy Father, who understands the thoughts of our hearts, before they be brought forth into words, hath no need of well-run'd Language to affect his sacred ears, nor hath required more than according to the ability, which he hath given to several souls: So the plainest phrase is best intelligible to the most of those that

# A Discourse of Liturgies,

that hear us: who are to give a rational assent, and say a fiduciary *Amen* to what we speak.

VII. Nor are the Prayers of the poorest Rustick ( who ordinarily salutes his neighbour and expresseth his mind to him in terms which the Critick calls *Nonsense* ) for their *Grammatical incongruities* or *defects in Rhetorick*, less acceptable unto God than the lofty strains and luxuriant issue of wanton Rhetorick in the prayers of others are, whose great study possibly is to put their prayers into handsome Language. Who knows not that many *Idioms* in other Languages are perfect *nonsense* in English? Yet who doubts but God accepteth in *every Nation* pious souls, powring out their hearts unto him in Prayer, by their mouths, according to the *Dialects* of their several Countries.

VIII. In very deed, the only *Nonsense* that can attend Prayer, is the *incongruity* of the tongue of him that speaketh with his mind and heart, or with the *understandings* of those who joyn with him. Let but the tongue be the true interpreter of the heart towards God, and the expressions of it be *commensurate* with the capacity and *understanding* of those that hear, and the Prayer shall be discharged from any guilt of *Nonsense* in the sight of God, accruing from a want of *Grammatical order* in words ( unless such want proceed from the Speakers *non-attention* and *carelessness* of his Spirit ) Yea, the Prayer which the *wanton Orator*, the *curious observer of words*, and *Priest* into the *proprieties* of them, may call *Nonsense*, may be most admirable sense in the ears and judgment of God and good men, whose eye is upon higher things in spiritual duties, than a well-tuned *esse posse videatur*.

IX. Yea, there may be in him that speaketh, such an *affectation* of *nicid words* and *curious phrases*, such a superlative care, that *Nouns Substantives*, and *Adjectives* may stand in due places, and *Verbs* be put in *right Adoods* and *Tenses*, that too many *monosyllables* or *polysyllables* may not hobble or *rumble* after one another, such a study for *peranomasias* and other *Fooleries of Phrase*, as may make the Prayer abominable both to God and to all good men: Whilst not the holy Omniscient God only, but even sober men easily discern the heart of him that speaketh, as to its *secret intencion*, gone a *whoring from God* ( to whom it should be united in Prayer ) after that *Strumpet Rhetorick* in which he never took any delight. Nor is the Prayer ( thus patched, and painted, and disguised by this Taylor-like art of words ) understood by those who would better know it, and to whom it would appear far more lovely in the *morning-dress* of a homebred, natural unaffected phrase.

X. Yet in regard that it cannot be reasonably presumed, that any, *publick Congregation* should be made up of persons equally intelligent



in the mysteries of Godliness, nor equally intelligent of words and phrases, nor equally considering that words are but the shell and skin of Prayer. Nor so, but that there will be many amongst them of carnal hearts; it is very reasonable that he who speaks in publick Prayer, should so speak, that whilst he humbleth his phrase to the meanest capacity and understanding (that his Prayer may not lose their *Amen*) he also *elevates his words*, above the *nauseam* and *just reproach* of the most *squammish ears*, even of those who far more regard the *starching* of the Prayer, than the matter of which it is composed, or the fervency of heart with which it is uttered.

XI. And doubtless who so in this thing keeps a *due mediocrity*, in the publick performance of the duty of Prayer, neither by too much *curiosity of phrase*, and *attention to that*, diverting his soul from the more serious and fixed *contemplation of God*, nor by mixing too much of *mans dung*, as *Luiker* calls it (alluding to that of *Ezechiel*) with *spiritual bread*, makes the duty a loathing to spiritual souls: Nor yet by too much *rudeness*, and *carelessness of phrase*, shall either give a just suspicion to others, that his heart attends not what his Tongue speaks, or offers a temptation to the more *carnal part* of his Hearers, to loath and contemn the Service, hath sufficiently discharged his duty, and needs be no further carefull of words in Prayer, unless (which it may be is not impossible) he can find out or invent some *modes and forms of expressions*, which upon the evidence of experience shall appear to be more proper means, than the use of other words, to warm the hearts of those that are to joyn with him, and to boyt them up to a greater degree of *fervency in spirit*, whilst they are in that duty serving the Lord. To which purpose, handsom *cadencies of periods*, a *lofty rolling stile*, affected *Paranomasia's*, pedantick *quibblings of words and phrases*, (fine knacks to please childish ears with) are so far from signifying any thing, that they are *cujus contrarium's* in the business, good for nothing but to loath pious souls. And indeed, those *phrases* which do this excellent deed, are experimentally found to be such as the inwardly affected heart of the Speaker immediatly dictates to his Tongue. It being most undoubtedly true, That words coming from the heart of the Speaker, find the nearest and readiest way to the heart of the Hearer; and the Souls of the hearers shall acknowledge themselves most affected, when the Speaker finds his heart most warmed and enlarged, as if there were a *Sympathy of devout Souls*, which is indeed from the mighty secret working of the same spirit of Prayer acting both, and at the same time preparing the Speakers heart and tongue to

## A Discourse of Liturgies,

dictate and speak, and the Hearers souls to hear, sigh, groan, and to give a fiducial assent, *Rom. 8. 26.*

### C H A P. II.

*The Gift of Prayer is partly Natural, partly by Industry acquirable. That it is promised of God, denied to none that will duly use means to attain it; but they may so far attain it, as in publick to pray without Forms, so as God shall accept it, and none have just cause of Scandal. That none worthy of the Office of the Ministry, need to want it, nor do, but through their own Sin and Negligence.*

I. **T**HE Gift and Grace of Prayer are two things: The Grace of Prayer, is a spiritual ability in the Soul, from which it is enabled from the Spirit of Adoption to go unto God, saying, *Abba, Father*, with an holy boldness, fiducial confidence, fervency of spirit, begging of him things according to his Will: This Nature doth not reach, Industry will not necessarily bring us to; for this God must send forth the spirit of his Son into peoples hearts, crying, *Abba, Father*, *Gal. 4. 6.* And none can do this but those who have received the Spirit of Adoption, *Rom. 8. 15.* But the gift of Prayer is nothing else, but an ability of mind to form words, expressive of such desires of our hearts, as are according to the Will of God, conjoynd with a faculty of memory, and of expression and elocution.

II. Hence it appears, that the gift of Prayer is partly natural; for from nature is the faculty of Meditation and Speech: partly by Industry attainable; For let us duly consider, what he hath to do that prayeth, more than to speak (that is in reference to the external part of Prayer, performable by the gift of Prayer) Prayer consisteth of a Confession of all sins, Supplications for supply of wants for our selves and others, and a thanksgiving for Mercies received. Sin is either Original or actual: Actual sin is a transgression of the Law of God. This Law of God is contained in his Word; all violations of it in thought, word, or deed are sins. Supposing a man in a capacity to meditate and speak, what is wanting to any, save Industry only, why he should not compose a Confession of Sins? If he knows what the Scripture saith of the imputed guilt of Adams sin, of our being conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity. What the Law of God requires and forbids, and considereth his own and other mens words and actions, and his own heart, to which other mens hearts answer in a great measure, why should he not be able to form a Confession in his heart, and (if he have

have any elocution) to speak it with his Lips? And if he hath any habit of knowledge of the Scriptures, as to these things, why should he not be able to speak this Confession to God *ex tempore*, as well as a Lawyer shall speak in matter of Law, or a knowing Philosopher discourse Philosophical Learning rationally, many times to the admiration of his Hearers?

It is further reasonable, that to a *Confession of sins*, should be added, an acknowledgement of the Justice of God in case of any Judgments already brought upon us or others, or upon supposition if God should bring upon us any. Surely, every Christian knoweth, or should know, that *the wages of sin is death*, that the least sin exposeth us to the *wrath of God here and hereafter*, &c. And if he hath a tongue to speak, can say so to God in Prayer. In the *supplicatory* part of Prayer, we *deprecate Judgment*, we *implore Mercy*, for our selves, for others, for souls, for bodies, all according to the Will of God; who so knows he hath a body and a soul, and knows the wants of both, knows what to ask for; and he that knows the Scriptures, is advantaged in that knowledge, and further is by them directed, what to ask for *absolutely*, what *conditionally*, what *Promises* to urge upon God in Prayer, what *Judgments* to deprecate, and in what *manner*: Nor is any so ignorant, as not to know what is good for himself or others in a natural sense; the Scripture tells him what is so *spiritually* and *truly*, and if he hath a tongue, he can surely say, *O God, I thank thee for*, &c. Doth he want Expressions? The Scripture is full of Expressions directive of him.

III. In short, (setting *Elocution aside*) now that the Word of God is in our own Language, there can be nothing but particular Christians horrible neglect of acquainting themselves with it, or their *non-observing* their own hearts, or not using themselves to the *exercise of Prayer*, that can hinder any private Christian from being able to speak unto God in Prayer, fully, profitably, acceptably, and so as none but prophane hearts shall be scandalized. And this Assertion is demonstrable.

IV. Besides this, God hath promised the help of his Spirit as to words Rom. 8.26. and matter (in the use of means) the Spirit shall teach us what to Luke 21: pray for, nor is this beneath the Holy Spirit, any more than to give unto suffering Saints what to speak Mar. 13.14. in the very hour they shall be called before men for Christs sake; for which there is a Promise, and they allowed therefore to take no care what to speak before-hand. We acknowledge that the Gift of Prayer is no special distinguishing Gift, but a Common Gift; but by no means can allow our selves in the suppressing of it.

V. Hence it is, that many a person whose constant employment is

not in the work of the Ministry, is able to *pour out his soul in Prayer* before God, in proper and apt expressions, without any further premeditation than is necessary, to take the noise of his worldly business out of his head, *so orderly and methodically*, and in such *handsom expressions*, that any *godly sober Divine*, though never so *Learned*, shall approve his performance, and bless God on his behalf.

VI. That any owning the *Name of a Minister of the Gospel*, should not be so *able*, is a great reproach to our Church, considering that this *disability* must proceed, 1. From a *want of knowledge in the Scriptures*, (which every Minister ought to know exactly.) Or, 2. From a *want of a due observance to, and a watchfulness upon his own heart and waies* (whereas he ought to excel others in the practical part of Holiness.) Or, 3. From *want of Elocution or freedom of speech*, or such other natural gifts, without which none can judge himself called of God to that holy Employment. Or, 4. From *want of exercising himself in the duty of Prayer*: All which are lamentable things for any professing himself a Minister, so much as to be suspected of.

VII. Yet that *de facto*, there have been such called by the name of *Ministers*, amongst us, and that there are many such amongst us still, cannot be reasonably denied: But we dare to assert, That all such are either such as for want of *Natural Parts*, are by all *Scriptural Rules* determined insufficient, and not fit for the Ministry, or such, as according to all *Scriptural and Ecclesiastical Rules*, ought to be removed from the Ministry, as neglecting to use the Gift of God bestowed on them, or neglecting to study the Scriptures, or such as *live* in open and known courses of Debauchery, or finally, such as *have* so used themselves to the lazy Devotion of *Book Prayers*, that they have choked their abilities, or provoked God in righteous Judgment to deprive them of them.

VIII. It yet remains a most *demonstrable truth*, that the work of Prayer is not such, as to the use of words in it, but that any Minister of any *competent abilities*, (as all Ministers ought to be) and who is in any reasonable degree acquainted with the holy Scriptures, and with any Christian diligence, either observeth his *own heart*, or *peoples converse*, and watcheth over his Flock but with half an eye, may so perform, as neither God shall be offended with his performance, nor any sober Auditor scandalized and made to *nauseate the Duty*. And it will (upon experience) be found impossible for any *State or Church* to maintain (by *imposing Forms of Prayer*) the credit of any Ministry, whom the people shall discern so woefully neglective of their duty, and *defective* in so noble a performance, in which they are excelled by the meanest

## and Forms of Prayer in Churches, &c.

9

meanest of the *Vulgar*. There being no other way (when all is tried) to maintain the Authority of the Ministry, than the employment of such, and only such persons in that work, who shall evidently appear to People, as to the *Gifts and Graces* of Gods Spirit bestowed upon them, to be taller by the *head and shoulders* than those are, over whom God hath set them. Other Devices may be tried; this only in the end will be found efficacious.

### C H A P. III.

*The Original of Liturgical Forms of Prayer. None for 400 years after Christ. None imposed upon any considerable Part of the Church, till 800 years after Christ, when all manner of Superstitious Usages had defiled the Church.*

I. **V** Hich being premised, it is no wonder at all, that neither Christ nor his Purer Church ever imposed upon the Church any Books of *Liturgies*. *Duranti* indeed tells us, That Christ himself (who certainly had an infallible Spirit, and a proportion of it without measure, if that may be call'd a proportion) yet used that excellent Form of Prayer, called the *Lords Prayer* (by which he taught his Disciples to pray; And that the Apostles used the *Creed*, called (but never yet proved) theirs: But he confesseth, that in *Primitiva Ecclesia diversi diversa quisq; pro suo velle cantabant, dummodo quod cantabant ad Dei Gloriam pertinerebat*. In the Primitive Church every one sang or prayed (for that he called singing) as they pleased, so that what they all did, related to the glory of God. When Christ sent out his Disciples to preach, he was so particular in directing them, that he takes care to direct them to provide a *Purse* and a *Scrip*, but none for a *Service-Book*: Nor did the Apostle *Paul* in his particular directions to *Timothy* or *Titus* (whether they were *Evangelists* or *Bishops*) though he ordered them to *ordain Ministers*, and charge them to fulfil their *Office*, by putting up *Prayers and Supplications* for all men, &c. so much as mention any *Missal* or *Liturg*y for their directions: which it is strange they should have omitted, had *Liturgies* been so necessary, as we are now told they be, that Religion without them cannot be preserved; nor *Heresies* without them restrained.

II. Those holy Servants of God knew, that the *Spirit of Prayer* was poured out in the world, and that the gift of Prayer was one of those gifts, which their Master when he ascended up on high did give unto men;



## A Discourse of Liturgies.

men; & were tender of delivering ought to the Church, which they had not received from the Lord: And (which *Terullian* said afterward) were willing that Ministers should pray *sine Monitore, quia de pectore*, without a Monitor (not a *Mummer*, as some would have it) because it was their duty to pray from their hearts; they therefore even in the Confession of our Adversaries, and the greatest Masters of the Ceremonies, left no Liturgies for the Church of God.

D: Missa ap-  
paratu. l. 7. c. 21

Bellarmin. De  
Script. Eccl. de  
Jas. Apostol.

III. Indeed *Claudius de Sanctis* and *Pamelius* (two Popish Divines) have discovered to the world the *Terra incognita* of certain Liturgies, fathered upon St. James, St. Peter, and St. Mark; which *Josephus Vicecomes* takes notice of (but doth not think fit to insist upon them.) *Cardinal Bellarmine* in his Book de Script. Eccles. neither mentions that of Peter nor Mark, but brands all Books (not mentioned by him, attributed to St. Peter) with the names of *spuriis & suppositiis*. That of St. James indeed he mentioneth, but tells us, that it is so basely augmented, that none can determine what of it was St. James's. But the Learned *Mornay* hath said enough to prove that these pretended Liturgies of the Apostles were all Fictions, and it will be no hard matter to evince every sober Reader the truth of it. Who knows not how hard a thing the Bishops in the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Calcedon* found it to find a place or two in the Writings of the Ancients, where the *Virgin Mary* was called *Deotimos*? Where had the difficulty been if these Liturgies had been in the world, and in *Proclus* his hand too (who was present in the Council of *Ephesus*) who, they say, transmitted that of St. James to the world, for in that Liturgie it is five or six times over: Nor certainly would the Members of the Synod of *Constantinople* have been at a loss to have proved out of this, the calling of the *Holy Spirit consubstantial with the Father*, had they ever seen this new invented Toy. Both in this, and *S. Marks* Liturgy Christ is again and again called *ὁ υἱος* with his Father, which certainly would have determined that great Question about that word in the *Nicene* and other Councils. Both in St. James's and St. Marks Liturgies we have the *reconjuratio* invented by *Felix* 480. To say nothing of the No ions of *Altars*, *Temples*, *burning Frankincense*, *Censers*, such as lived in *Monasteries*, *Confessors*, the Prayer for the Pope. In St. Marks Liturgy, the Prayers for *Sub-deacons*, *Readers*, *Singers*. All which things have made them justly rejected by all sober Writers, and accounted of no better authority than the *Epistles of Christ* and *Abagarnus*; for the very mention of which, *Gelasius* of old, called *Eusebius* his History *Apocryphal*. Nor are those pretended to be St. Peters and St. Matthews of better authority. The same things are to be objected against the



the first, and surely, if *St. Peter's Vicar* thought better of it, the Church of *Rome* would have used it before that made by *Gregory* the Pope (which is that they use.) In that pretended to be *St. Mathew's*, there is mention of the *Epistle* and *Golden Number* (knacks invented long since) Prayers for *Popes, Patriarchs, Archbishops*, (persons *St. Mathew* never knew) *Nay, Basil, Chrysostome, Gregory the Great*, the *Nicene Council* have their honourable mention in it, which were all 3, 4, 5, or 600 years after *St. Mathew's* time. So that *Baronius* himself is ashamed of all, but that called *St. James's*, nor doth *Saintes* mention more. To say some things might be added, yet they might be their *Liturgies*; is of no value: 'tis that wick *Bellarmino* and *Baronius* have said, and some *Semi-Protestants* have taken up after them: For which they have *ref. 1510*. no further proof than the Title of a Book set by a Popish Priest, which proves all as well as some.

IV. Nor is there any thing more clear to us than this, both from that of *Terullian* (mentioned before) who lived *Anno 200.* after Christ, and from that long since quoted by *Smellinimus*, out of *Ensebins*, That *Constantine* the Emperour made Prayers for his Army, which unquestionably he would not have done, had there been then any *Liturgies* (especially any known by the Reverend authorities or Names of *Mathew, Mark, Peter, or James*. Besides that, *Bishop Hall* could pretend no higher authority than the Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*. (of which more by and by) For any Pretences of any in the *Jewish Church*, they are perfect *Apocryphals*. What truth there may be in what *Viccomes* saith, that the *Pagans* had their *Service-Books*, to direct them in their Idolatrous Service; which he proves out of *Cicero, de Misse appa-Festus, Clem, Alexand. and Lactantius*: We are not at leisure to enquire, nor think it much material; for surely Christians are to take no Copies from them.

V. The highest pretended Authority then for publick Liturgies, is from the 18th Can. of the Council of *Laodicea*: What time that Council was celebrated, is not agreed. *Garanz* saith, it was *Anno 364.* towards the latter end of the time of *Liberius* the Pope. *Longus* and *Baronius* (from whom he had it) dates it 315. under Pope *Sylveſter*; which he proves, because it was before the time of *Basil* and *Theodoret*, which are no Arguments; (for *Basil* wrote not till near 380. nor *Theodoret* till *Anno 420.*) *Balsamon* (a man well enough skilled in the Chronology of the *Gr. Councils*) sets it after the Synod of *Antioch*, and next before that of *Sardis*. This Synod decreed (saith *Balsamon*) that the same *Liturgy* of Prayers should be used in the *Morning* and *Evening*: Suppose his a true Copy, every one

knows,

knows, that *Antiphona* *evangelii* doth not necessarily signifie a Form of words in Prayer, but meerly an Order of Prayers: But besides this, *Caranza* gives this Canon another title, and phrase too: The Title, *De Orationibus quotidianis*. The Canon, *De eo quod semper supplicationes orationum, & ad horam nonam & vesperam oportet celebrari*. According to him, (in which were but 22 Bishops, *Longus* saith 32.) this Synod in which was only decreed that there should be constant Prayers at Nine in the Morning and in the Evening; not that they should be the same Forms.

CAN. 233

VI. Nor can we believe there were at this time any Forms of Prayer made, for all Ministers to use; because we find the Council of *Carthage* only imposing this, *That if any Minister made any Prayers for his use, he should not use them, till he had communicated them to his more able Brethren*: Whence we gather, that at that time. which was about 395. there were no Forms of Prayer imposed upon Ministers.

VII. In which we are the more confirmed by the 12th Canon of the Council of *Mela*, (commonly called the *Milevitane Council*) held in *Africa*, under *Aurelius* the Archbishop, where (so far as their Jurisdiction reached) they restrain Ministers, to the use of such Prayers, as should be approved by the Synod, *ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel per minus studium sit compositum*: lest any thing through ignorance or negligence should be vented against the Faith, the Doctrine of which was then wofully shaken by *Pelagius*, to condemn whose Errours, that Council (which was but a Provincial Synod of 60 Bishops) were convened.

Morneus de  
Missa, l. i. c. 6.

VIII. We are not ignorant of the *Liturgies* fathered upon *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, and *Ambrose*, a little before this time. *Basil* was made Bishop about the year 372. *Chrysostome* about the year 382. *Ambrose* about 381. But he must have more Faith to spare, than we have, who can either believe, that the *Liturgies* published under their names, are indeed theirs; or that they indeed imposed any. There are two fathered upon *Basil*, one printed 1569. translated by *Masius*. The Greek Copy is far more large than the Latin, and so differing one from another, that 'tis no hard thing to determine of their authority, as the Learned *Morney* hath done. For that of *Ambrose*, we have it not in his works, *Erasmus*, *Perkins*, and others, condemn those two Prayers (which are found in his works, preparing the Priest to celebrate Mass) as none of his; in which censure, *Robertus Cocus*, yea, and some *Papists* agree with him. What Vouchers therefore the *Papists* have for that *Officium Ambrosianum*, which *Jacobus de Voragine*, in the Golden Legend, and *Durandus* in his *Rationale*, tell us a Tale about, we

cannot

cannot tell. For thus fathered upon *Chrysostome*, there are divers Copies of it, scarce any of them agreeing with one another. Let those who can think that to grave a man as *Chrysostome* could direct the Church to pray for Pope *Nicholas*, who lived almost 700 years after *Chrysostome* was dead, or for the Victory of *Alexius*, (which was in a Battel fought 700 years after he was dead) or who can believe that such a confused Fardel of stuff could be made by so worthy a person, believe it was his if they will. We are the more confirmed in the contrary, by the latter craft of *Liturgymongers*, in leaving out the Names of *Alexius* and *Nicholas*, in their latter printed Latine Copies, the Translation of which, they yet unwarily father upon *Erasmus*, who tells us, he did not think it like to be true that ever *Chrysostome* made it.

*Erasm. Epist. in Paraph. in 1 Cor.*

IX. To be short, When we find that *Josephus Vicecomes* (as superstitious as he was) can fetch no higher authority for *Liturgies*, than *Arnobius*, who lived 306. *Athanasius* who flourished 330. *Hierome* who lived 385. *Viktor Uticensis*, who lived 480. nor any plain proof from any of these: Only some of these spoke of Books of the Christians, *ubi summus orator Deus*, (so *Arnobius*) *Sacros Scripturarum Libros* (so *Athanasius*.) *Liber Hymnorum & Mysteriorum*, (so *Hierom*.) *Libros sanctos Domini*, (so *Uticensis*.) We cannot but conclude, that at this time there were no *Service-Books* made, directing Forms of Prayer, though possibly *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose*, and others might write some Prayers to help some weak Christians which they might transcribe.

X. But what need we any further Testimony than is given, by one as zealous for *Liturgies*, *Rituals*, and other *Ceremonies*, as ever lived in the world? It is that of *Durantis* in his *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, l. 5. c. 1. *Durantis* having ingeniously confessed (what none can without great impudence deny) that neither Christ nor his Apostles used any prescribed Forms but the *Lords Prayer* and the *Creed* (nor doth or can he or any other say a word to prove they used them) tells us that in succeeding times because the Church was rent by Heresies, *Theodosius* who lived about the year 380. intreated Pope *Damasus*, "That some Ecclesiastical Office (or Liturgy as we call it) might be made by some Ecclesiastical Catholick person, upon which Pope *Damasus* commanded *Hierom*, who was then in *Beirlehem* with *Paula Eusebium*, and other Virgins, to abide there, and make a Liturgy for the Churches, because he was well skill'd in Hebrew, Greek, Chaldee and Latine; which he obediently did. He appointed how much of the Psalms should be read each day in the week, he also ordered the reading of the Gospels and Epistles out of the

*Duranti Rationale, c. 2. l. 5.*

## A Discourse of Liturgies,

" Old and New Testament: When he had done it, he sent it to  
 " Rome; it was approved by Pope *Damasus*, and made a Rule; and  
 " *Damasus* had the honour of the work, because it was done at his  
 " Command. *Gelasius* (who lived 490. and was Pope) and *Grego-*  
 " *rius Magnus* (who lived 600 years after Christ) added Prayers  
 " and Songs, the Lessons and the Gospels. *Ambrose*, *Gelasius* and *Gre-*  
 " *gory* (saith he) added the *Gradualia*, *Tractus*, *Alleluiah*, other Do-  
 " ctors of the Church added other parts. — Thus far *Durantus*.

XI. He fetcheth the Original of *Liturgies* from *Theodosius*; but how probably, let the Reader judge, who shall consider, that this good Emperor was Emperor but 17 years; that in that time he convened that great and venerable Council of *Constantinople*, where were 150 worthy persons: Now let any judge how probable it was, that this Emperor should never propose the business to these; (for their *Canons* are only about grave and necessary things) and send to Pope *Damasus* about this: He was a man too much acquainted with the efficacy of fervent Prayer to restrain it. Nor indeed doth *Durantus* say, that he caused any Prayers to be made, all that he saith *Hierom* did, was the appointing an Order of reading the Scriptures.

De Inventor.  
 rum. l. 5. c. 11.

XII. We must therefore go a little further than *Theodosius* his time. *Nuda ab initio omnia & simpliciter, Mysteria a Christo tradita apud Apostolos erant*, &c. (saith *Polydore Virgil*.) One Pope after this time brought in one piece of the *Liturgy*, another brought in another. *Celestinus* brought in the *Introitus Missæ*, *Damasus* the Confession, *Gregory* the responds; and indeed till *Gregories* time there was no considerable use of it, nor any imposing of it. This was near upon 600 years after Christ.

Ep. l. 7. c. 194.

XIII. Pope *Gregory* is usually said to be the worst of all the *Bishops* of *Rome* that preceded him, though the best of those that followed him; a man of no great Learning, for he confesseth himself (in one of his *Epistles*, that he understood no Greek) not blameless for *Morals*, (for he was accused before *Mauritius* the Emperor for the murder of one *Malchus*.) Indeed the *Protestant Writers* make good use of him, for his Testimony, about some Points, viz. that about the *Scriptures*, *Images*, but chiefly in the question about the *Head of the Church*.

XIV. The truth of the Story is. Two great Councils having before determined the Patriarch of *Constantinople* and the Bishop of *Rome* equal, only allowing to the latter the empty Title of the *Bishop of the first Seat*. *John*, Patriarch of *Constantinople* was not able to endure that, and so upon the Point, though both refused the Title, yet both strove to act the part of an *Universal Bishop*: The Patriarch had the advantage

advantage of *Gregory*, because (the Empire being then in the East) the Emperors Seat was at *Constantinople*: which caused divers Epistles between *Mauritius* and *Gregory*, (yet extant in *Gregorius* works) *Mauritius* in the heat of this Contest, was basely murdered by *Phocas* (one of his Captains) who was by the Souldiers made Emperor. *Gregory* v. *Greg. Epist.* (tending the Interest of his See) writes a most unworthy Letter to the Empreſs, ſavning upon that vile Murderer, and beſeeching him to 44. favour *St. Peters* Succeſſor, and to remember who ſaid, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church*: Soon after this, *Gregory* dies; but before he died, he made a *Liturgy*, (if we may believe *Pamelinus*, he made a *Leſſionary* or *Calender*, directing Scripures to be read in order, an *Amiphonary*, directing the Reſponds for Priests and People, and an *Order for adminiſtring the Sacraments*.) Others think the two latter were made after; but however, theſe reached no further than *Gregorius* power, the Extent of which was at this time but ſhort and narrow.

XV. *Sabinianus* was Pope immediatly after *Gregory*, he lived but fix Months; *Boniface* ſucceeded him, he alſo fell in with *Phocas*, the Murderer of his Maſter: and the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* being now out of favour with *Phocas*, becauſe he could not flatter him in his horrid wickedneſſes and cruelties, *Phocas* deſerts him, and gives *Boniface* (what he aſked) the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*: This was about the year 605. And now he might pretend ſome authority to impoſe his Service-Book.

XVI. But yet he did little (except in *Germany*) for the *Lombards* continual quarrels with the Emperors, till the year 800. much hindred the Popes power all that time, they lay cloſe at home, all this while encreaſed in Superſtition, and the ſottiſhneſs and ignorance of their Clergy encreaſed, but in Jurisdiction they did little: Only taking advantages, one while favouring the Emperors, other while the *Lombards*; they added (by the favour of both) to *St. Peters* Patrimony, by all wicked acts imaginable, to be read at large in *Mornays Myſterium Iniquitatis*, and in many other Books.

XVII. But about the year 800. *Charles the Great*, being come to the Empire (who was a vertuous and noble Prince, only highly addicted to the See of *Rome*) *Adrian* was then Pope, the Emperor was a great Favourer of him, he confirmed to him all the temporal Poſſeſſions which the Popes had got either from former Emperors, or from the Commanders of the *Lombards*, and added much more, which his Son *Ludovicus Pius* confirmed. This Emperor alſo ſetled the civil differences which had a long time troubled the Empire, and he had a



vast Empire, it contained *Italy, Germany, Hungary, France, and part of Spain.*

*Duranti rationale, l. 5. c. 2.  
Mornei Hist.  
Papatus, p. 141.  
Fol.*

XVIII. Now it grew a seasonable time to impose a *Liturgy*; to which purpose, *Hadrian* the Pope moved *Charles* the Great, that it might be by his civil authority imposed; *Gregories* Liturgy was it, saith *Duranti*. *Ad quod Carolus Imperator omnes Clericos Minis & Supplicis per diversas Provincias coegit Libros Ambrosiani Officii comburens, i. e.* To which *Charles* the Great compelled all his Ministers with threats and punishments; and burning those Books that went under the name of *St. Ambrose*. The Learned *Morney* saith the same almost; where we only observe, That the first imposing of a *Liturgy* was importuned by the Bishop of *Rome*, and done in favour to him, in *Adriani gratiam*; (saith *Morney*) and began with a persecution, but the Universal Bishop must give the Catholick Church a call of his Office, and impose a *Liturgy* as far as he could.

\*It were worth the while to know by what book they prayed in the mean time. *Jacob, de Vorag. Leg. aurea in vita Greg. Duranti id. Fox Martyrol. Vol. 1.*

XIX. But after this, there was no small contest; one *Eugenius* comes and complains to Pope *Hadrian*, concerning the imposing of *Gregories* Liturgy (it seems he liked that of *St. Ambrose*, i. e. said to be his) better. *Duranti* saith his importunity caused some Holy Father's newly broke up from a Council, to meet again, who to determine this difference, reverently and unanimously agreed that both the *Service-Book* which was made by *St. Ambrose*, and that also made by *Gregory*, should be laid on *St. Peters* Altar, sealed up with the Seals of many Bishops, and the Church-doors should be shut, and the Fathers should spend the whole night in Prayer, desiring God by some sign to determine, which of those *Service-Books* he would have to be used universally: It was done accordingly. In the Morning they go in, and find that of *St. Ambrose* lying in its place, that of *St. Gregory* torn in pieces, and scattered all about. (If it be a Lye, Reader, thou hast it as cheap as we, and maiest read it in the Golden Legend, *Duranti* and *Mr. Fox* his *Martyrology*, and doubtless in many other places, but in those three we have read it.)

XX. But now what do the Fathers determine upon this Miracle? We should have concluded, That it was the Will of God that *Gregories* *Service-Book*, being full of all manner of Superstitious Trash, should never be used, nor *St. Ambrose's* imposed, only tie by to be used in that Church if the Parson pleased. But (saith *Duranti*) they concluded this a sign from Heaven, that *Gregories* *Service-Book* or *Missal* should be scattered abroad, and used in all Churches, and that of *St. Ambrose* only used in his own Church. (The business was, *Gregory* had been Pope, but *Ambrose* had not.) Accordingly Pope *Hadrian* moving the Empe-



for *Charles*, *Gregories Service-Book* was now imposed upon all Churches in France, Hungary, Italy, Germany, and in England too, for here 60 years before this, viz. Anno 740. *Ina* had subjected his Kingdom to Pope *Gregory*.

XXI. By, or before this time, the whole Fardel of Popish Ceremonies and superstitions were brought into the Church, nothing wanting (saith the Learned *Morney*) but the worshipping of Images, (which *Charles* the Great alwaies opposed and wrote against, yet this also was about this time decreed by the Second Council of *Nice*, which *Caranza* saith, was celebrated, Anno 781. under *Adrian*) and Transubstantiation, for which the way was now prepared too; for at this time the Lords Supper was called the Sacrifice of the Mass, (saith *Morney*;) And he who reads the Ecclesiastical History of the *Magdeburgenses*, will find, that all the trash of Ceremonies and all manner of superstitious usages were now come into the Church. *Gregory* almost 200 years before had defended *Purgatory*, and was indeed (as *Alstedius* calls him) the Master of the Ceremonies, he who defiled the Church with all manner of gross and abominable Superstition.

XXII. Now from this time, which was about the year 800. till the beginning of Reformation, which was about 1517. in Germany did the Church of God lie hid in the Wilderness, some witnesses to the truths of God there were, but no considerable open Assemblies, that durst oppose the Popes power. The Popish Mass-Books were every where used, and long before the Reformation, the Latine-Service was Universal; for to that height of folly was the Holy Father come, that he could not think it enough for the Communion of the Church, that they should every where pray for the same things, (which was alwaies done) and in the same words, phrases and forms (which he had brought in) unless they also did it in the same language. And this imposing of Forms, did admirably comport likewise with the ignorance and foolishness of the Clergy in the 6th. and 7th. age, and so downward; all the world knows, in what a pickle *Erasmus* found the world in as to Learning: *Reuchlin*, and he did much to amend it.

XXII. As the work of Reformation improved, the Mass-books were thrown out in England, nothing considerable was done untill the 2. and 3. of *Edward* the 6. which was about the year 1549. and 1550. King *Edward* observing that Divine Service was, throughout his Kingdom, yet used in an unknown tongue, and that in several modes, (here was the Com. Pr. after the use of *Salisbury*, *Tork*, *Bangor*, *Lincoln*, &c.) appointed the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, (*Cranmer*) and several other Bishops:

Stat. 1. Ed. 6. 1.

Stat. 5. &amp; 6.

Edw. 6 c. 1.

Bishops and Learned men, to make one convenient order of the same and fashion of Common-Prayer for publick use. Which they did, and presented it to the King, and it was imposed by Authority of Parliament, in the first year of his Reign. In this first Book were many gross remains of Superstition: The King therefore caused it to be revised again, explained, and made fully perfect, and this second Form was established by Authority of Parliament, Anno 5. and 6. Ed. 6. and annexed and joyned to explained and perfected, to that Statute, adding also a form and manner of consecrating Archbishops, &c.

XXIII. These prudent Reformers, considering they had to do with a people newly come out of the dregs of Popery, did not think fit at once to do all that was to do: In the first Edition of the Common-Prayer-Book, they left (if we remember right) Prayers for the dead still to be used, gave directions for using the Cross in the administering the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. In the Second Edition, these and other things were left out; neither did they think fit at that time to make a new Liturgy, (the Common people would have thought it a new Religion) they therefore translate the old Gregorian Missal, leaving out the Prayers for the Pope, and to Saints, and for Saints departed, and a few such things, as could not be used without palpable Idolatry, and translate the other Prayers in the Mass-Book out of Latine into English, and these were some of them established by that Act, 5. 6. Ed. 6. Stat. 1. The truth of this any one that can understand Latine may convince himself of, by comparing the Mass-Book with the Com. Pr. of Edw. 6. Where he will find betwixt forty and fifty Col-lects translated *verbatim*; and if he compares the other parts with the Roman Breviary, the Roman Ritual, and the Pontificale Romanum, he will yet further see the truth of it.

5. Eliz. c. 18.

XXIV. Nor indeed could it be imagined, that those first Reformers should leave at that time all Ministers at liberty, or to their own conceived Prayers, when most of them were Papists in their hearts and generally so foolishly ignorant, and insufficient, that they could not have done any thing. Which very cause held in Qu. Eliz. time, (where 1. Eliz. 2. the Common-Prayer was with some further emendations specified in the Statute, again imposed) In the fifth year of Her Reign, by Act of Parliament, the Common-Prayer was ordered to be translated into Welch, and used in Wales. And this is the true Story both of Liturgies in the general, and the English Liturgy in special.

XXV. By this time the Reader, who hath not a mind to revive Pythagoras his School again, and to sacrifice his Reason to an *avertis enu*, and believe every thing that is told him, before he hath tried the truth

of it, may see reason to desire the present L. Bishop of Exeter to tell him (if he can) where those same *ancient models* of *Liturgies* (not *Roman*, but *Christian*) and contrived by the holy *Martyrs* and *Confessors* of the blessed *Reformation* of Religion, are to be found? The *Remonstrant* was challenged to make it good out of ancient Models, but thought fit to wave the business in his Reply. It hath been the old Plea, but let them prove it if they can, (saith *Didaclevinus*.) Or if his present Lordship of Exeter doth not think fit to answer for another, yet it is reason that he should justify his own words. He hath told us, in p. 8. of his *Considerations touching the Liturgy*, That, "The Ancient Churches from the very first Century did use such publick wholsom Forms of sound words in their Sacramental celebrations especially, and afterwards in other holy Administrations or publick duties as made up their solemn, devour, and publick Liturgies, which Patterns, all Modern and Reformed Churches of any Renown, have followed according to the many Scriptural Examples and Expressions in set Forms of Prayer, Psalms, Confessions and Benedictions, commended to us by holy men in all ages, and by Christ himself."

XXVI. The world is grown too wary to believe any thing of this, because any one saith so; and the Doctor is too wise, to undertake to prove this: Let him prove, That *Christ prescribed the Lords Prayer for a Form*, or that the *Apostles ever used it* so. 2. Let him prove, that in any of the four first Centuries there was any *Stated Forms of Prayer used in the Church*. 3. Let him prove, that any *Modern Reformed Churches imposed any Forms of Prayer*, so that those and no other might be used. And 4. That they did this after the *Pattern of the Ancient Churches from the first Century*. All these things are to be proved; nor is it possible to prove them.

XXVII. In the 18th. p. of that Discourse, he tells us, That, "It is *Dr. Gaudens* a Jesuitical Artifice and back-blow used by some to aver, though *Consider p. 19.* falsely, That the English Liturgy was nothing else but the *Romish Missal* or *Mass-book* turned into English: 'Tis true, he saith, some things (very Scriptural) devout and excellent, which the Roman Missal had taken, and retained after the ancient Forms of Liturgies of the Church, were severed and taken as Wheat from Chaff, and Jewels from dross, by our wise Reformers, and preserved in the English Liturgy, conform to pious and unsported Authority. We challenge *Dr. Gauden*, & all others of his mind, to make this good if they can. It is true, there are some things in the English Liturgy, that are not in the *Gregorian Missal*. But let any one take *Missale Romanum*, both the old one, and that established by the Council of Trent,

*Breviarium*

*Breviarium Romanum, Rituale Romanum, and Pontificale Romanum*, and compare them all with the printed Com. Prayer-book of 5 and 6 E. 6. and then judge whether he can find a sixth part of the latter, which is in none of the former. If he finds that there is very little added, let him then learn how to trust men talking after such a magisterial rate, and annexing no proofs of their words.

XXVII. If the Reader finds it true, that (whatsoever Dr. Gauden saith) there is in our *English Liturgy*, as it is commonly exposed to sale, very little but what is to be found in the *Mass-Book* in Latine, let him then go to the Bishop of *Exeter*, and desire him (for his credit sake) to shew him those *ancient Forms of Liturgy used in the Church* out of which *these Forms of Prayer* were transcribed and taken, which must be immediately after the first *Century*; or tell him, what that same *pious and unspotted authority* is: If he tells him, it is *Pope Gregory*, (which he must if he speaks truth) let him tell him, that he hath heard, that he was a *vile wretch*, accused for a *Murderer, the Father of most of the superstitious usages now in the Church of Rome*, one who understood not the *Greek Tongue*, (as himself confesseth) a man of no admirable Judgment (witness his pretended Commentaries upon *Job*, which might have as well been upon the *Revelation*) a man very far from being either *pious, or unspotted*, or fit for his *Seat*, one that defended *Purgatory*, that fawned upon *Phocas the Murderer*; in short, one of no deserved Name or Authority in the Church of God.

XXIX. By this Discourse it appears, that there was no *Liturgy* directing Forms of Prayers for the Church, till *Pope Gregory's* time Anno 600. nor any imposed till the time of *Charles the Great*, Anno 800. when all manner of superstitious usages were brought into the Church; nor was it then imposed without a *Persecution* attending it. And this Reader, is the *pious and unspotted Authority*, the Bishop tells thee of. From hence thou wilt also conclude, the antiquity of the *English Liturgy*, the reason of its first being imposed, and no further reformed, either by King *Edward*, or by Queen *Elizabeth*. In King *James* his time, it received some additions, what Reformation we cannot tell.

XXX. By all this Discourse, it appeareth that there is no divine Prescript, no *Apostolical Tradition*, no *Universal Tradition*, no *Example of the Purer Primitive Churches*, for more than 400. yea, 700 years after Christ, which can be pleaded for imposed *Forms of Prayer*, by any that make any conscience of their words, or will undertake to prove what they say.

CHAP. IV.

*An Enquiry into the state of those Churches which first commended or imposed Liturgies, at the time when they first made such impositions.*

I. **T**Hough it may seem absurd to enquire, whether the *gray hairs* of *Liturgies* be found in the way of *Righteousness*? When we have evinced, that they have no such pretended *Antiquity* and *Age* to glory in, and that the Assertors of such Antiquity for them, do but impose upon the world; yet considering what we remember we have learned out of *Aristotle*, That there is a youthfulness in respect of *Age*, or in respect of *Manners* and *Conditions*. It may be worthy of a further enquiry, Whether yet there may not be such a necessity of them, or such a *comeliness*, *beauty*, and *gravity* in them, as may not only justify Magistrates in the imposing of them, but oblige every soul that hath ought to do with reason, to fall in with the use of them, yea, passionately to desire them (even as much as *Rachel* did children) which we shall the better determine, by reviewing the first occasions of *Liturgies*, and the complexion of the Church in those ages, when they were first made, or most used.

II. I think we may say of *Liturgies*, as Christ said of the *Bill of Divorce*, which *Moses* allowed; *Moses* verily for the hardness of your hearts, gave you a *Bill of divorce*, but from the beginning it was not so. He that had a residue of *Spirit* (as the Prophet saith) made one for one. The Church played *Moses* his part in the business of *Forms of Prayer*. Christ who had a residue of *Spirit*, the *Spirit* given him without measure, imposed no *Forms of Prayer* upon his Ministers, or Church. The Apostles, who had the first and most plentiful pourings out of the *Spirit of Grace*, imposed no such things. Christ indeed gave a more general direction to his People in Prayer, to ask things according to the *Will of God*, and in his *Name*; and more particular directions in that excellent *Form*, called the *Lords Prayer*; but that (as *Duramus* idly saith) either Christ, or his Apostles used the *Lords Prayer* (ordinarily) as a *Form of words* in Prayer, or that the Apostles used a *Form of words* to express their Faith, or imposed the *Credo* (commonly called, but hardly to be proved) theirs (which the same Author asserteth) must certainly be proved out of some such *Canonical Writings*, as the Epistles of Christ to *Abagarn*, or to *Paul* and *Peter*, for there is no Authentick Record of any such things; but in pro-



cels of time indeed the Church began to do some such things.

Rev. 3. 17.

III. The highest mention we can find, is, that thin *Synod* of the Church of *Laodicea*, made up of thirty two *Bishops*; and this (whatever *Bishop Hall* saith according to *Longus*) cannot be proved (as we said before) to have been before the year 364. (as to which time *Balsamon* and *Cayanza* agree it) but truly it had been no great wonder if this Church, which many years before was grown neither hot nor cold, but in such a temper, that God was ready to *spue it out of his mouth*, (for which we have an Authentick Record in the *Revelation*) should long before this time have made such a *Salvo* and prudent Provision for the Laziness of her Ministers: He that shall read the *Canons* of that *Synod*, against the Ministers hanting *Taverns*, and using *Inchantments*; as also the other *Canons* about *exorcising*, and the several *Officers* and *Offices* of the Church, will see reason enough to conclude, the wofull corruption of the Church in those parts, if not to suspect, that it was of a far lower date than is pretended.

IV. The *Synod* of forty *Bishops* at *Carthage*, (which was the third *Synod* of *Carthage*) only enjoined Ministers to communicate to their more able brethren, their *Prayers composed for their publick Congregations*; this was in the year 397. Yet that the face of the Church at this time, had many spots, and much impurity cleaving to it, may appear by this *Synod*, by their sixth *Can.* against giving the *Lords Supper* to, or *Baptizing such as were dead*: by their many *Canons*, 17, 25, 27. against *Clergymen* hanting *Taverns*, and keeping scandalous company with women, their 30 *Can.* against *joyial Meetings in Churches*, their 36 *Can.* about the *Chrisma* or the anointing Oyl, which no *Presbyters* must make, And that this *Synod* consisted not of the most infallibly wise Fathers, appears, by their Learned 29 *Canon*; where they take pains to decree that every Minister should give the *Sacrament of the Altar* (so it seems they had learned to call the *Lords Supper*) fasting. Yet this *Synod* in the business of *Prayer*, did not think fit to restrain every Minister, only having so loose and insufficient a *Clergy*, they order the weaker sort, having composed *Prayers*, to confer their Notes (before they used them) *cum fratribus instructionibus*, with their more able Brethren.

V. After this, the Council of *Mela*, Anno 416. grew more bold; and ordain (as to their Province, for what authority had they further?) that the Ministers should use no *Prayers*, but such as that *Synod* had approved. They might justly expect, that the Churches under their inspection would hardly swallow this new *Pill*, if it were not lapped up in some good Reason, and therefore they give their reason for it,

left



lest something should be vented against the true Doctrine of Faith, either by some Ministers negligence or ignorance. The cause of that Synod meeting, was the censuring of *Pelagius*, that great enemy of Grace.

The Errors which *Pelagius* had broached, were these:

1. That *Adam* should have died though he had never sinned.
2. That Infants were born without Original sin.
3. That there is no need of the assisting Grace of God (sin being once pardoned.)
4. That all the need we have of Grace is, to illuminate us in the knowledge of Gods Commandments.
5. That the Grace of God only helpeth us to do his will more easily and freely.
6. That the words of St. *John*, If we say we have no sin, we deceive our selves, were only figuratively true, not literally.
7. That the Saints praying, Forgive us our Trespases, was appointed them on the behalf of others, not themselves.

Or, 8. If for themselves, only as an expression of their humility: not concluding them to have any sins to be forgiven.

Against these Errours that Reverend Synod made their eight first Canons. *Pelagius* having used diverse Arts ( the story is too long to insert ) to secure his Doctrine from a publick Censure, had far diffused the poyson of this Doctrine. This Reverend Synod observing his Errors to be in such things as are the daily matter of Ministers Confessions and Supplications, thought fit for the prevention of the diffusing this Venom by Ministers in their publike prayers, as also that the Church might have due Confessions made, as well of Original sin as Actual, and due Petitions put up for pardoning and assisting Grace, &c. And considering that the Church was so debauched now in her Clergy, that some through ignorance could not do it, some through Laziness would neglect a due care in doing that to which they were able. Others possibly ( though that be concealed ) through a perverse and corrupted Judgment, would not do it, appointed Forms of Prayer to be used, and restrain the liberty of Praying to the Ministers within that Province, obliging them to use the Forms approved by the Synod.

VI. The reason for which ( as *Durandus* tells us ) *Theodosius* much about this time, or a little before, set St. *Hierom* to compose a Calendar, indeed rather than a Liturgy ( for *Durandus* saith, he did no more then order the Scriptures to be read, though *Pamelius* hath transmitted to us an Antiphonary and Sacramental Liturgy, as well as a Lectionary of his composing ) was in regard of Heresies risen up in the Church. So that hitherto, we have had no other account given us of

## A Discourse of Liturgies,

the composing Forms for publick worship, than 1. The Ignorance of the Ministry which they were forced to employ. Or 2. Their Laziness and Negligence. Or 3. Their, or the Peoples falling into Errors.

VII. But after that the *Universal Bishop* got up into the Saddle, it was reasonable that he should have a power of *Universal command*, and to shew his authority, he must impose a *complete Liturgy* (as to all parts) and enjoyn *universal conformity*, which yet he could never obtain, till he got a great interest in the *Civil Magistrate*; who had a civil power over what was then almost the *Universal Church*. Nor must this serve the turn, for this *Universal Bishop* must have all Churches, not only speak the same words and phrases, but in the same Language too; hence he brings in *Latine Service*. All which also admirably comported with the *Sottish ignorance and debauchery of the Clergy*, in the sixth and seventh Century, and so downward, till the times of *Reuchlin and Erasmus*, when Reformation began to dawn, and the light began to spring out of darkness. Whether these ends were good and lawful, and the imposing of Forms of publick divine Worship were applied as just means in order to them, viz. either to cure the ignorance or negligence of the Clergy, or to bring the Church to an unity in Doctrine, Worship, or Affection, shall be examined: For if either the end or means be proved unlawful and against the Will of God, they talk vainly for the continuance of them, that urge no more than *Humane Prudence*; *Worldly Wisdom*, being no other than perfect Folly, because *Enmity to God*.

### CHAP. V.

*Universal Conformity of Devotion, as to Words and Syllables, no good End: Imposing Forms of Prayer, no reasonable, just, or sufficient means to prevent Heresies, or to cure the Laziness or Insufficiency of the Ministers of the Church, proved by Reason and by Experience.*

I. T cannot but be confessed, that it is a noble end for any Church to aim at, to take care, that the people may have the truths of God offered to them, and not through the ignorance or laziness, or perverseness of its Ministers, be served with an Husk in stead of bread, or a Scorpion in stead of a Fish. This end is approvable both from the Word of God; and the light of all Christian Reason. But that there should be an Oneness in the devotion of people, as to Letters and Syllables, and Phrases, and Forms of Sentences, is an end so stultic, and low and insignificant

nificant in it self. that we cannot expect it should be justified from Scripture, which indeed saith not a word to that purpose.

II. And although the prevention of *Errors and Heresies*, and the poisoning of the people with them, is also the prevention of the mischief arising to the Church from *ignorant and lazy, or erroneous Preachers or Ministers*, be (as I said before) a *noble end*, and well worthy of the Churches care, yet before we can allow the same honour to the imposing of *Liturgies* and stinted *Forms of Prayer*, as means in order to those ends, we must both enquire, whether they be *lawful means*; and also, 2. Whether they be such as *Reason* will evince, or *experience* hath proved effectual to the obtaining those ends, and that 3. *Without bringing upon the Church a mischief every way as great*, as what they are pretended to deliver us from.

III. That when Christ himself appointed *no stated Forms of publick Devotion* for his Church, to the use of which, and no other they should be tied; nor his Apostles, though guided by an infallible Spirit; nor the *Prayer Church* for some hundred years after, it should remain yet lawful for the Church, not content to repress and prevent Errors and Heresies, by such waies and means as the Apostles used, but by this new device, to endeavour it, may be justly a question to all sober Christians.

IV. Especially considering, that as a *liberty in coming to the Throne of Grace*, and asking there whatsoever we will (provided it be consonant to the *Will of God*, and begged in the *Names of Christ*) is one of the great privileges purchased by Christ for his Church; so the Spirit of *Grace and Supplication* is eminently and frequently promised for their assistance, and that not only to teach them *how to pray*, but *what to pray for*, Ro n. 8. 26. Nor is this promised only to the *Priests* in a Church, but to every individual Christian; and the *gift of Prayer*, whence flows mens abilities to express themselves by words and phrases, is one of the most excellent gifts which we are bound to covet, and to improve. All which being considered, it is far from being clear, that the restraining of Christians, especially of Ministers in the exercise of the noble gift of Prayer in the publick *Assemblies* of the Church, is a lawful means in order to any end, it looking like that *quenching of the Spirit*, which is forbidden to all men by the Apostle, 1 Thes. 5. 19. and *choaking the covering of the best gifts*, which is commanded all Christians, 1 Cor. 14. 1. For to what purpose should those Talents be desired; which man hath authority to command to be laid up in a *Napkin*? Nay, which had far better be laid up in a *Napkin*, than used, if the Doctrine of some be true, concerning the *transferring*

## A Discourse of Liturgies,

*excellency of Forms of Prayer*, above what are conceived by Ministers, according to the gift of God bestowed upon them.

V. Besides, it may be worthy of enquiry, whether it be possible, or at least ordinary with men to read any *Prayer*, with that fixed and constant *intention of mind* and *servency of spirit* (the two necessary requisites of Prayer) as they may speak unto God from the dictate of their own hearts, while their souls are more abstracted from created Objects, than they can possibly be, while it is a great piece of their work to look upon their Books, to see what to say next: For what some pretend, that the diversion is greater in *conceived Prayer*, by the employment of the mind in prompting the tongue what it should say next; besides that, this is a spiritual employment of the mind within it self, neither doth it require any such study, where the heart is right with God, and so conscious as it should be of its own sins and wants, and so acquainted with the Word and Promises of God, as every reasonable Minister ought to be.

VI. Nor is it out of the way to consider whether this method of *Book-praying* will not expose the *Ministers of the Gospel* to a perfect contempt amongst the people, who will certainly conclude their *Parson* not able to do what every ordinary Christian doth. Of which contempt we have had a plentiful experience, nor do we believe that any thing hath so contributed to our breed of *Lay-Preachers* as our *stinted Forms of Prayer*; Whilst the people have apprehended their gifts better than their Ministers, an easie temptation hath served them to usurp their Office. Nor will any Minister longer keep his authority amongst a knowing people, than by his performances of his Office, they shall be convinced he is higher in gifts than themselves; For rational people will not sacrifice a blind faith to the *Bish. of Exeter* magnifying the Forms of Prayer in the *Common-Prayer-Book* beyond all measure, but will be enquiring wherein their excellency lies. Are they more perfect Summaries of things to be confessed, or to be petitioned for? Is their phrase more scriptural? &c. Or if they do see an excellency in them, it will be hard to inform them, that the *gift of reading* is more admirable in their Minister at Church, than in their servant at home.

VII. Now if the *Universal imposing* of any Forms upon the aforementioned considerations, appear unlawful of it self, or in regard of some necessary or certain consequent, there needs no more be said to prove that men should have made use of some other means in order to those good ends of preventing errors, and the mischiefs arising, or possible to arise from a *negligent* and *ignorant* Ministry to the *Church of Christ*.

VIII. But

VIII. But suppose the use of this means *lawful*; yet if *Reason* might then dictate unto them that applied this means *That it was never like to effect its end*; and *Experience* hath since taught posterity that upon the experience of 80 years, it hath proved ineffectual, certainly the very light of Nature should have taught the first imposers, to have used some other means, and will yet direct us (who have the advantage of experience) in this, to excel our Fore-fathers.

IX. It may put the rational world into a fit of astonishment to consider that so many *Bishops* should think that the imposing of Forms of prayer would ever contribute any thing to cure the *ignorance or negligence* of the *Clergy*, when in very deed, it was the right way to feed both, and to continue these scabs upon the *Church* for ever. For a man to be able to compose a prayer fit for a Congregation, requires no less than a very competent skill in the *whole body of Divinity*, and a very large *knowledge of the Scriptures*, which would have engaged Ministers to study the *Scriptures*, and to stir up their gifts. But when they had once thus provided for them, there needed no more skill for a Parson, than every ordinary person had, *viz.* an ability to read the written prayers. It is true, they had yet some work to do in *preaching*, but this was soon taken off their shoulders, by adding still Forms of prayer, the reading of which should require such a length of time, that no room was left for Sermons, or if there were, *Homilies* came quickly after, which would serve the turn: So that these imposed *Liturgies*, in stead of serving their end, in curing the *ignorance or negligence* of Ministers, did most wretchedly serve to fill the Church with *ignorant and lazy Parsons*, yea, and debauched too; for now the Ministers work was ready, and he might stay at the Ale-house till Saturday, and yet be as fit for his work, or at least do as much the next day, as was required of him, which was not only miserably exemplified in the *Papish Church* (till *Erasmus* his time, and the beginnings of Reformation, when they began by the Protestants opposition to be quickened to a little better attendance to their work) but is at this day sufficiently evident, as to the generality of their *Priests*, to say nothing of the liberal experience of it, which our Nation hath afforded.

X. Nor certainly could just reason dictate it a proper or adequate means to prevent, or restrain Errors and Heresies: for how should this ever do it? Shall preaching by a *Form imposed* be superadded to praying? Or shall there be *Forms of prayer* imposed for the Pulpit as well as the Desk? These certainly had been too gross impositions. If not, had not the Ministers as much liberty to vent their Errors in their Pulpit-prayers, as they would have had in the Desk? Or in their  
Sermons



Sermons as in their prayers? But then people would have apprehended, they say, that they vented their own conceits, nor the Doctrine of the Church? And would they not far better have apprehended this, if the Minister had only been enjoined to read a perfect *Systeme of the doctrine of Faith summarily* drawn up. (Such was the wisdom of the Council of Nice in the case, though indeed that Creed be far from a perfect *Systeme*) This no sober Minister would have scrupled. Besides *Hereses* are commonly the issue of *Schismes*, and experience hath told the world that nothing ever so contributed to the breeding of *Schisms* in the Church, as *imposed Forms of prayer* have done: So contrary hath it appeared to the *Sensus communis* of Christians in all times, that the Ministers of the Gospel should be restrained in the gift of prayer, I say in all times since the Reformation of the Church, nor would the Popish Church have ever been able to have imposed theirs so long upon the people, if besides that *Fire and Sword* which alwaies attends his Holiness his commands in case of disobedience; they had not wisely kept the people from the sight of the Scriptures, or from the hearing of any Sermons (almost) For nothing but the peoples ignorance, could have secured this devotion so long. And no sooner came the light of knowledge amongst the people, but many of them either saw, or thought they saw, that this kind of *Praying* was not all that God required of his Ministers. And in those Churches where were *Forms of prayer* (though translated into an intelligible tongue) there were continual *Factions* and *Separations* from that which they called the Church, and more in England than else-where, because no reformed Church had such a *Liturgy*, nor so imposed.

XI. But suppose the imposing Forms of Prayer lawful, and that it had effected its end, done something to prevent *Errors* and *Hereses*, and some *mischief* which from the *Ignorance* and *Negligence* of Ministers might have come upon the Church. If yet the mischief coming by the means used hath been, or is like to be as great, as that which they are designed to prevent, (or though not so great) if there be other *more proper and regular means* (not subject to the same ill consequences) and more certain to obtain the end which may be used, certainly all prudent men will conclude, that these old ineffectual mischievous means, should be no longer used, but those far better applied.

XII. The mischiefs which the imposing *Forms of prayer* have brought upon the Church, have been, 1. The *raising up* of a notoriously ignorant and lazy Clergy, not giving themselves to meditation and Prayer (two of those things which Luther thought necessary to make a *Divine*). 2. *Separation from Church Assemblies*. 3. Dreadful *Persecutions* upon

upon *Godly Ministers* and people, who could not judge their *conformity* lawful. The admirers of these Forms perswading Princes to establish them by their civil authority, and then suggesting to them, that the Ministers and people not complying with them, was out of a principle of disloyalty to their *Princes*, and disaffection to their authority, and bringing *non-conformists* under the crime of *Lese Majestie*, evils certainly not much less, than what *Imposed Forms* were pretended to prevent.

XIII. Yet were the continued use of these means in order to such ends more tolerable, if there were no other to be found most certainly justifiable, far more regular, and more effectual, as to the end. Would the *Prelates of the Church* prevent the rise and growth of errors and heresies by the Ministers *negligence, ignorance, or perverted judgment*? Let them, 1. Take care, that none be admitted into the *Ministeriall Office* or trusted with the charge of Souls, but such as shall be thoroughly examin'd, as to their knowledge in the body of *Divinity*, and of whose gift in prayer, they shall have taken an *Experiment*, and who shall not first by some open Act declare his *Assent*, to the *Doctrine of Faith*. May they notwithstanding this be lazy? Or afterwards perverted in judgement? To what purpose serve *Synods, Presbyteries, &c.* But to take a constant account of the Ministers of several Parishes? how they use their gifts? discharge their Office? to admonish, the irregular, suspend, deprive them, &c. Certainly, as this means is more proper and more regular, more rational for the obtaining the aforesaid ends, so the use of it would be far more effectual, and all good people would be satisfied, and rejoyce in it.

XIV. From this discourse it appears, that the pretended necessity of a *Liturgy* or *imposed Forms* of prayer in any Church, is no other than such as the Author of *Discoliminius* told us merrily, *Van Dosme* conceived there was, when the fire burnt his Shins, that the *Chimney* should be pulled down and set farther off; when it had been more asie, and every whit as effectual for him, to have removed his Shins from the fire; yea such as (the same Author tells us) was the necessity which *Simon* the French Monk saw, that the poor people of a *Province of France* were under (wanting cloaths) to *skin themselves* and send their *Skins to be tanned*, that they might have cloaths for their backs, when as they easily saw, the remedy would be as bad, as the disease. In every deed there can be no pretence of the necessity of *imposed Forms* of prayer, for the obtaining any of the ends aforesaid, of which assertion we have a demonstration both in the *Church of Scotland*, and other reformed Churches, where there is no such imposed *Liturgies* though possibly

possibly most of them have *Liturgies* composed, to be used at liberty.

XV. Nor would any sober persons oppose the composing of a *Liturgy*, for publick Assemblies, which might by way of punishment be enjoined to those to use, whom the Governours of the Church should suspect perverted by Error, or discern *lazy and negligent*, as to the *stirring up of the Gift of God bestowed upon them*. But that such Form should be imposed upon all, cannot certainly be either *lawfully* or *prudently* advised or wished, lest Gods Gifts given to his Ministers, should be *smothered*, their desires to improve them, (according to Gods Command) *quenched*, good people scandalized, and the most *ignorant, negligent*, and worst of men encouraged in the highest Services of God. In fine, lest the hearts of any Subjects by such unwelcome Impositions, should be *aliened from their Magistrates*, who (except in the matters of their God) desire no other Priviledges or Liberties from them, as the reward of their dayly Prayers and Allegiance, than their own goodness shall prompt them to give them.

## CHAP. VI.

*A particular Examination of the five last Arguments used by the Bishop of Exeter, to convince the Necessity or high Expediency of a Liturgy.*

I. **W**E have hitherto considered whatsoever Antiquity could pretend for the usefulness of imposed Forms of Prayer in the Church, and weighed them in the Ballance of Reason; but the Reverend Bishop of Exeter improves the notion of their usefulness higher, telling us, *they have very many great and good influences upon true Religion, and upon every Church*; which he endeavoureth to make good in five Instances, which we shall crave leave modestly to examine.

II. First, He saith, *It conduceth much to the more solemn, compleat, and august and reverent worship of the Divine Majesty in Christian Congregations, where otherwise the most Sacred and venerable mysteries must be exposed to that rudeness and unpreparedness, that barrenness and superficiality, that defect and deformity, both in matter, manner, judgement and expression, to which every private Minister is daily subject, as late experience hath taught us*. It will be very hard to find any thing in this more than words.

1. It will be granted, that the publick Service of God ought to be performed *solemnly, reverently, and compleatly*; for that same *august serving*

serving of God, we do not well understand the Doctors meaning; if he means *outward Pomp and Splendor*, in the habits of those that serve at the Altar, or lofty high-flown phrases, swelling words of vanity, we never read that God either required it, or delighted in it, nor can we from any reason conclude the necessity of it or usefulness of it, as being contrary to all the Copies of Prayers and Sermons set us by Christ or his Apostles, and no way suited to the *simplicity and plainness* of the Gospel-Devotion: God is unquestionably then served most *reverently and solemnly*, when the worshippers of him approach him with most fear, and worship him with most affection and  *fervency of spirit*, wrestling with God, (as Jacob did) which the Prophet interprets by *weeping and making Supplications*.

2. It is true, that Minister sins, who (through *ignorance or negligence*) expresseth any want of *Reverence of God* in his heart, by *impertinent and rude expressions*, (not fitting to be used in civil converse with men) or which may make the Service of God contemptible, to others.

3. But that *every Minister* must needs be thus guilty, (with the Doctors leave) *experience* hath not taught us, and is very *uticharitably* and *falsly* asserted. We have not (blessed be God) such a pitiful Church, that there are no Ministers in it, but are liable to the charge of serving God in Prayer with *rudeness, unpreparedness, barrenness, superficiality, defect, deformity*, and that both in *matter, manner, judgement, and expression*. No Jesuit ever had the confidence so to asperse the Ministry of England, nor could speak more *fordidly* to their dishonour. Possibly there may be some, (and there have been far more than now are) who may be too liable to this charge. But where's the fault? Is it not in those to whom the trust is committed of taking a due cognisance of such as offer themselves to be *ordained*, or admitted to the cure of souls? Should not they take care to admit none, but such as are both able to preach and to pray? Do they not discharge their work conscientiously, while they admit such as are not able to pray, without such rudeness as is here complained of? Or make no more conscience of it, than to do it *unpreparedly, superficially*, with so much *barrenness, defect, and deformity*? Such as neither have *judgement* to compose a Prayer, as to *matter*, nor *elocution* to pray, as to *manner*, so, but that people shall have just cause to *nauseate* the Worship of God.

IV. If the Doctor means (by his phrase of *every Minister being subject, &c*) only that 'tis possible that the best Ministers may so be negligent, &c. as to run upon this Rock, that is as true concerning *reading*

*Prayers*: none will deny, but he that can read very well, may read false, and if he keeps not his mind intent, no doubt but he will perform the Service, as rudely and superficially by reading, as by speaking; Instances might be given of this, and shall if need be: And certainly the conceiving of a Prayer will command more attention of mind, than reading can. All therefore said under this Head, is meer air.

Pag. 10.

III. But secondly, He tells us, *That a Liturgy is a most excellent means to preserve the truth of Christian and Reformed Doctrine by the consonancy of publick Devotions, into which otherwise corrupt minds are apt to infuse the sour Leaven of their own corrupt Opinions.* Fine words again! But what reason? We have before shewed it to be,

1. *Questionable, whether a lawful means or no.*
2. *If lawful, by no means effectual, except it reach to all Praying and Preaching too.*
3. *Not the only means, a good Summary of Christian Faith is far more proper and rational.*
4. *A means bringing a mischief as bad as what it pretends to cure, yea, far worse, fit for nothing but to breed rents and separations, the mothers of all Heresies.*
5. *An Apocryphal means by which men make themselves wiser than Christ and his Apostles, or the Parer Church.* We shall only propound this Question upon this suggestion: If this be true, how comes it pass, that all the *Arminians* and *Popishly affected Clergy-men* of England are such Zealots for a Liturgy? The thing is demonstrably true, that it is so; let the Doctor answer this Question by his next.

IV. But Thirdly, *A Liturgy* (he saith) *is necessary for the holy Harmony and sweet communion of all Christians, as well in National, as Parochial Churches, whilst thereby they are all kept in one mind and Spirit, praying the same things, and cheerfully saying Amen to the same Praises and Petitions.* Here is the old Fallacy (still of *Verba elegantia, pro sensu simplici.*) That all Christians have the same common wants, and ought to pray for the same things in the main, is to be granted, though as particular persons, so particular Churches may have renewing wants, not common to all (for which a *Liturgie* will not serve the turn) But is there any so simple, as not to understand, that the same things may be prayed for in different words and phrases? The Doctor here mistook his Mark, he should have proved, that it is the *Will of God* that *Christians* should maintain their Communion in the use of the same phrases, letters, and syllables. And when he had done that, a *Popish Priest* should have improved his Notion, & concluded that because the



one body of Christ should have but one tongue, and since the confusion at Babel, men in several Nations have spoke several Languages; therefore to the perfection of the Communion of the Church, there is not only a Liturgy necessary, but a Liturgy every where in Latine, that being a Language most universally known. The Churches external Communion lies in their keeping the same Sabbath, performing the same Acts of Worship (of which prayer is one) confession of Original and Actual sins, praying for the same mercies generally, &c. not in their saying all the same words sure.

He tells us (fourthly) That a Liturgical form is not only of great benefit, and comfort to the more knowing, judicious, and well-bred sort of Christians, but highly to their security, and to the holy and humble composition of their spirit in the worship of God; who otherwise are prone not only amidst the publick devotions curiously to censure, but scoffingly to despise, (By the way this is no Demonstration, neither of their Christianity, nor of their good breeding) yea, many times to laugh at, and at best to pity, or deplore, the evident defects and incongruities which appear in many Ministers odd expressions, and incongruous waies of officiating, &c.

To reduce these many words to a short sum of reason, the usefulness of imposed Liturgies is here pleaded. 1. For the benefit of the most knowing, judicious, and well-bred sort of Christians. 2. To avoid the censures, scoffs, and jeers of others. The Dr. hath not yet told us what benefit accrues to the former from a Liturgy, nor yet what solid grounds of comfort for them to feed upon, the want of which it may be is the reason, that if others guess rightly, that take all the professors of Religion that can but give any understanding account of the Systeme of Divinity, and live in any sobriety of life and conversation, and number them (taking their judgment as you go along) and it will be found, that ten for one are against any imposed Forms: On the other side, it is certain, that some others make it all their Religion: So it was of old. That holy and Learned Oeculampadius living in a Noble mans house, who yet was a Protestant, and would seem a forward man in the Reformation, complains of the slender regard the greatest part of the Family gave to him, and to his Ministry, in a Letter to his friend in these words, "Such a man (saith he) sent for me, that I might publickly in the Church instruct his Family in the Christian Religion, or rather feed them with the words of Christ, who were initiated already. I counted it my chief duty to make the Evangelical Law known familiar at hand to them, that so afterwards they might of themselves proceed in the true and sincere

## A Discourse of Liturgies.

“ sincere study of Christianity, Peace, Meekness, Modesty, Charity,  
 “ Piety, Faith, and Confidence in God. All the time of *Lent* that I  
 “ was there, nothing hindered, but that I might every day read a piece  
 “ of the Gospel to them, and expound it, and exhort them out of it to  
 “ the study of Godliness: But after *Easter* it was less convenient;  
 “ For the Family was not at leisure to spend much time at Church,  
 “ their business did so call upon them; and there are some that are  
 “ sick of the Church, if they tarry there never so little while, *pleriq; ne*  
 “ *firmi ubiq; mori est*, &c. Most people, as the manner is, *amant quo-*  
 “ *tidie audire, imo videre Sacrum*; love to hear, yea, to see service eve-  
 “ ry day, yea, to hear those things mumbled over, that they understand  
 “ not, to see the Ceremonies, to be present at the Blessing, to com-  
 “ mend themselves perfunctorily unto God; and so think they have  
 “ been religious enough of all conscience in that day wherein they  
 “ have done this, *quod sane exigui fructus est, & credo pleriq; interim*  
 “ *conducibilis esset arare & texere*; which truly (saith he) is little  
 “ worth, and I am perswaded it were better for many to have been  
 “ plowing, or weaving, or riving of Logs, or doing any other work.  
 “ And (if they may be believed, nor is it incredible) find more com-  
 “ fort in the *Liturgia* than in all the Promises of the Gospel, the reason  
 “ is, *Missæ non mordet*. For the *Scoffes* and *Fears* of such as are possessed  
 “ with a Spirit of Prophaneness, 'tis hard to avoid them. Nor are we  
 “ further concerned, than not to give just cause to them to prophane the  
 “ Worship of God; which may be done without a *Liturgy*, if the Go-  
 “ vernours of the Church take due care, that none but persons fit in re-  
 “ spect both of Parts and Piety be admitted to, or continued in the  
 “ exercise of the Office of the Ministry.

V. But it seems this Master of our *Liturgical Feast* hath kept his  
 “ best wine till the last, for he tells us, that a *Liturgy* is necessary, or condu-  
 “ ceth at least mightily — above all — to the edification and salvation,  
 “ as well as the unanimity and peace of the meanest sort of People. *Salva-*  
 “ *tion and Edification* in order to it, are great things, so also are unanimity  
 “ and peace, and doubtless by all just and lawful means to be endeavou-  
 “ red: But how shall a *Liturgy* conduce to these? Certainly, the Cap-  
 “ tain of our Salvation hath directed the best and most proper means  
 “ for the *Salvation and Edification* of souls, and we need not devise o-  
 “ ther than what he hath appointed; yet did he never institute a *Li-*  
 “ *turgy*, nor the Apostles after him. He tells us, That a daily variety of  
 “ Expressions in Prayer or Sacraments, is much at one (to the Vulgar) with  
 “ *Latin Service*, little understood, and less remembered by them; they are still  
 “ out, and to seek, when a new Minister officiates, yea, and when the same of be-  
 “ affects

L. I. Epist. Oc-  
 culamp. & Zu-  
 ing lii. These  
 words may be  
 a Glafs for  
 these times.

affects variety of words where the duty is the same. For the peoples remembering, it were worth the while to examine the Vulgar people, where a *Liturgy* is constantly used, how much they remember of it? If the Doctor would do this, he might possibly be convinced, that a *Liturgy* is not such an effectual means to imprint *Divinity* notions in peoples memories. As to the *peoples understanding*, the reading of the *Liturgy* signifies as little; if the furious Zealots for *Liturgies* amongst the Vulgar, were examined of their sense of the *several phrases*, they would make a wild Interpretation. It is not the using of a *Liturgy* will bring people to such an understanding the *Body of Divinity* as is necessary to him that would understand a good Prayer, (whether it be a stinted Form, or no) but their understanding of a good Catechism to be wrought in them by a frequent exercise of *Catechizing*; and when they once understand the Principles of Religion, they will easily understand a Prayer, (though they do not alwaies hear the same words) where the Minister doth not affect a vanity and singularity of phrase; which if he doth, the *Governors of the Church* ought to restrain him, by admonition and other Censures. This is the way to make people understand Prayers, (whether the Phrase be the same, or divers) provided it be not phantastick and vain. By this it appears, that the *Bishop* hath said nothing to convince the world of any necessity of *imposed Forms*, nor yet of any expediency in them. We have before offered enough against them, so that thus much may suffice to have spoken of *Imposed Forms* in the general.

## CHAP. VII.

*Supposing Forms of Prayer Lawful, yet every Form is not. What necessary, or reasonable to be found in publick Forms. Doctor Gaudens unhandsome and false Representations of Ministers refusing to use the Common-Prayer.*

**F**ROM our former Discourse, every intelligent Reader will easily conclude, that we have neither asserted it unlawful to compose a *Form of Prayer*, nor yet to use it, either in *private* or *publick*, no nor yet to impose it upon some: All that we have questioned, is the lawfulness of imposing *Forms of Prayer* upon all *Ministers*; as well those whose gifts are eminently known, and their diligence and conscience in that duty sufficiently experimented; as those who either through *Ignorance* or *Laziness*, are not fit to be trusted, without such a

guide

guide in the publike service of God. Nor do we think it impossible that a Minister of eminent gifts, through some bodily, or spiritual distemper, may possibly be so out of course, that he may lawfully enough help himself with a Form: but because a *Staffe* may be useful for an *old withered body*; and for a *vegete and lively body*, that hath accidentally got some *Vertigo* in his head, or wound in his foot, it will not therefore follow, that it is reasonable, that it be enacted, that none should walk without it.

II. But certainly in reason, those Forms which should be either publicly or privately used, *should be such rare Patterns of Prayer, as might justly commend themselves to all ears*, as containing full confessions of sin *Original and Actual*, full Petitions for *spiritual and temporal Mercies*, for our selves and others, as also *proportionable Thanksgivings*, and all these expressed in Scripture phrases, so ordered and couched, that the hearers may be convinced, that there is nothing contrary to the Will of God in them, nor any momentous thing, by *Gods Will* allowed us to ask, which is omitted. It is also reasonable, that such Forms should be so worded, so every way circumstantiated, that no sober ear could be offended at them, all conscientious Christians might say *Amen* to them, and if any should be needful to plead their cause, he might have more to say, than that jejune commendation, *Nothing can be said against them but may be answered, nor found in them but what is capable of a very good sense*. These are lamentable commendations for *Forms of Prayer* to be imposed upon a Church, full of holy, learned, and godly Ministers and People, who cannot be cheated into a blind Belief, That they are the best, because such a man said so. And no private Minister must presume to rate his private abilities above the *Shekel of the Sanctuary*: From whence will easily be concluded, that supposing it lawful to use *Forms of Prayer* in publick, yet it will not follow, that it is lawful to use every Form that shall or may be tendered to us, but such only as for matter, manner, and circumstances, shall appear to us agreeable to the Word of God.

III. We say, 1. It must appear to us that the *matter of those Prayers be such as Gods Word allows us to ask of him*; otherwise we ask not according to his Will. 2. That the *mode and manner* of Praying prescribed, be such as Gods Word alloweth, either by express Letter of Scripture, or just consequent. 3. That no *appendant circumstance* make the use of them unlawful, which as to the matter and manner are lawful enough. For none is so ignorant, as not to know that in matters of practice a thing may *ex accidenti* be unlawful, which is not so *per se*, or of it self.

IV. This now brings us from our general Discourse concerning the lawfulness and expedience of any Form, to a more particular consideration of the particular Form of Prayer in the *English Liturgy*, according to the Copies now printed and sold: (For what those were that were established by Acts of Parliament we cannot tell, and therefore must restrain our Discourse to that *English Liturgy* only, which is ordinarily to be had in Stationers Shops, and at adventures from thence transmitted to many Churches.)

V. And we cannot but take our selves concerned a little to speak in this case, when the Bishop of Exeter thinks fit to brand all those Ministers that are willing to accept his Majesty's most gracious Indulgence, and to forbear the use of the Common-Prayer; as also all those sober persons, that are not so fond as his Lordship of it, with *rebelliousness, inexcusable moroseness, an antilibertical humour, perovisness, ingratitude, schismatical petulancy, pride*, such as only fancy they could mend some words and phrases in it, or put some *Abuses* to it, such as sacrifice their judgments to their *Credits*, yea, and (he had almost said) *Consciences* too; such as stand in need of it to help their frequent infirmities, restrain their popular and insulting levity, to set bounds of *Discrimination, Decency, Charity, and Piety* to their *extravagancies*; and brands their pourings out of their souls to God, (without the *Common-Prayer-Book*) with the ugly Notions of flat, dull, and undecor'dedly tedious, of a confused length, like a *Skain of Yarn* coarse and snarled, sometimes so dubious between wind and water, fence, and Nonfence, fashion and fashion, boldness and blasphemy, &c. Is it not time when this Gentleman thinks not fit to speak all this, with much more such stuff, in the *Syriack Tongue*, but upon the Walls, in the face of all *Israel* in the *English Tongue*, to make some reply, to let both him and the world know, That though we have not so learned Christ, as to render *reviling* for *reviling*, nor dare pretend to an ability to give the Bishop word for word, of this nature, but shall willingly allow him *protestatio* in that Art and Practise; yet we do humbly conceive our selves able to give some reasons of our present forbearance, which may possibly be judged good and sufficient, if the Reformed Churches may be our Judges, and not such of our Brethren at home, whose only desire is to have an occasion against us, and know not how to find it, but in those things which concern the worship of our God.

VI. If, indeed, any of us have hitherto used it, and are still satisfied in our Consciences both of the lawfulness and expedience of it, yea, and were disposed immediately to have used it, before the Declaration of his Majesty came forth, in case we had been required so according to Laws in



force, rather than for default to have been punished (as the Bishop suggests, p. 4.) Or if any of us thought the iterated use of the *Lord's Prayer*, the daily repeating of the *three Creeds*, the *ten Commandments*, the *Confession of sin*, and the *Church Catechism* not only *wholesome* and *convenient*, but also *necessary*, (as he hints, p. 2.) and that in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, there are only some *verbal defects*, *obsolete words*, &c. that need emendation, and we have only *forborn* the use of it, because his Majesty hath had a *compassionate eye* to some mens *infirmity*, then indeed the *forbearance* of it, as to such *Ministers*, may be judged what doth not become *judicious*, *sober men*; but not knowing any such, we cannot but look upon these as most false and unworthy suggestions, designed to no other purpose, than to beget in his most Sacred Majesty an ill Opinion of *able and conscientious Ministers*, who (as shall God willing hereafter appear) have other more grave and momentous Reasons to assign, why they have forborn the use of it, not only in whole, but in part; yea, though possibly they formerly have used it, it not being impossible that either something may have intervened since their former use of it, which may have rendered the same practice now in their judgments unlawful, or that upon the fuller disquisition of the questions about the use of *Imposed Forms* in the general, or these in particular, they may be convinced, that their former practice was their error, not after conviction to be returned to.

VII. We shall therefore speak, that we may both free our selves, and before the world excuse those of our Brethren, who are of the same mind with us, either in whole, or in part, leaving what we shall say to be duly considered by all sober Christians, and submitting our selves to the candid judgment of such persons as shall desire to make a judgment of persons and things, according to a Rule of Righteousness and Reason.

#### CHAP. VIII.

*The first Reason of divers Ministers not using the Common-Prayer. Their dissatisfaction as to the imposing of any Forms Universally. Divers reasons of that dissatisfaction.*

I. IT is not clear unto us that it is lawful for all persons, and at all times to limit themselves by any *stinted Forms of Prayer*. Where God hath given a gift of Prayer to his Ministers, we cannot but think it is their duty to improve, and use it, if indeed God hath denied that gift

gift unto any; or by his providence any way hindereth the exercise of it, we (as was said before) do not doubt but such persons, or any persons at such times, may help themselves by a *Form*; but where God hath given any that gift, we conceive it is a manifestation of the Spirit given him to profit others by, and that he is defective to his duty, that doth not use it to that end; we are yet to learn, that it is not as lawful to impose *Forms of Sermons* upon Ministers, as *forms of Prayer*; both of them are lamentable restraints put upon the gifts of God bestowed upon his Ministers, to that very end; that by the use of them they might be profitable unto his people.

1 Cor. 12. 7.

II. We are sure it is the unquestionable duty of every one that prayeth, to do it with the highest *intension of mind imaginable*, and with the greatest *fergency of Spirit*, and that it is not lawful for any man in prayer, to allow himself in any thing, which may either divert his mind from the most fixed contemplation of God, or *interruption upon his duty*, or which may any way cool the heat, and *fergency of his Spirit*. We cannot be induced to believe that any one can possibly so keep his soul fixed upon God, or so intent upon God whiles he reads a Prayer, as while he speaks it from his own conception; we find by experience (not to determine positively of the frame of other persons Spirits) a great difference in the intention and fervency in our Spirits, when our words in prayer are directed, and determined, by the inward heat, *fergency, and affection of our hearts*, from what is, when our words are determined for us by other men, yea, by our selves before the time of prayer, we humbly conceive, that every Christian stands bound, not only to look that there be an habit of fervency in his heart, which at all times should dispose it to duties of communion with God, but that a particular fervency should attend the *Act of Prayer*; If we durst boast of the former, yet we find the latter certainly hindered by a prescribed Form, and we do believe this may be experienced by any person's speaking to a man for his life, we do not think it possible for any man to have, or shew the like *affection and fervency in reading a Speech* which another hath made for him, no nor in what he hath made for himself, before that time; as he may by such words as the present sense of his condition in that moment of time shall dictate to him: nor have we ever heard of any *malafessor* at the bar that brought his Speech for his life in a Form, if he did, we believe there was (even by the hearers) discerned a vast difference betwixt such speeches, and such as a person speaks at that time, to whom a lively sense of his condition, dictates words in that hour.

III. Nor can we believe, that any Minister praying in any Form of

for rational, and superintending *animus* to affect his hearers hearts, as he who *useth* them. As in preaching, there is a certain lively efficacy of the voice which every hearer discerneth, more in the Preachers speaking *ex animo*, than from his reading a Sermon, which is past denial evidenced, though it be not so easie to say what it is. So that a Sermon, yea, an ordinary *Oration* so spoke, moves and affects the hearers, infinitely more than a Sermon, or an *Oration* read out of a paper (though it be never so well starcht up with *Oratory*, and set out with the highest advantage of an *Oratorial* reading tongue) so we believe, and find it in the matter of prayer; and in very deed, the reason of this we conceive lyeth much in this, because the Speaker himself is (discernably) not so much affected in reading, as in speaking. 'Tis one thing for the heart and affections to precede the action of the tongue, and to set it on work; another thing, for them to follow the tongue, and be commanded by it.

IV. Speaking is an immediate Act of the Tongue, but commanded by the Soul; the Tongue is but the Souls Organ, by which it exerciseth that power which God hath given it, and it cannot be so well performed, as when the Soul that directs, performs its work by dictating immediately to it. So that much of the Spirit and life of prayer is lost, in praying by Forms.

V. Nay, lastly, (to add no more) if there were nothing else in the case, we should think it very disputable, *whether it be lawful for us in the publick Worship of God, especially as to the momentous acts, and parts of it, so do that for which we have no command in the Word of God, no precedent, or example;* and we cannot but think, that the holy Psalmists variety of prayers; and the variety of prayers which we find used by the several Saints, and holy pen-men of Scripture (none of which as to words and phrases agrees *per omnia* with another) should rather reach us, that when we go unto God in prayer (observing the general rules of prayer laid down in the Scripture) we should take unto us words *de novo*, as God shall put them into our hearts, than borrow words from others, hardly fitted to our hearts, or present necessities. If any have not ability to do it, we conceive it is his own fault, and it were far more consonant to the rule of Gods Word, that such should be removed from Gods Altar, than that the gifts of God bestowed upon others for the benefit of his Church, should be restrained for their sake, which we think would be something like his act, who cut the man fit for the bed, because the bed was not fit for him. Certainly, in all congruity of reason, if the Church be *perfect*, and must needs continue so, with a generation of men, who either through ignorance, or through

through a world neglect to stir up the gift of God in them, cannot pray without a book, and for their sake, a Liturgy, or fixed Form in prayer be necessary, yet from hence cannot be concluded any lawfulness, much less necessity, that those, to whom God hath given other abilities, and another spirit, should be obliged to use it, or that it should be imposed upon them.

## CHAP. IX.

*The Ministers second Reason, drawn from the dishonourableness of the lawfulness of using any Forms of humane composition, formerly desired, by use in an idolatrous service, conjoined with the scandal of many Christians arising upon that account.*

I. **B**ut suppose we were satisfied, that it were lawful for Ministers of the Gospel to use Forms of Prayer, and that at all times, and that this were no stifling of the gift of prayer, no diversion to the mention of our minds, nor abatement in the fervour of our spirits, not to the affections of our people (to do any thing apertly tending to any of which, is simply unlawful) yet there are particular reasons which appear to us cogent enough, as to the restraint of us from the using of this form.

II. We cannot but have some doubts whether it be lawful for us in the worship of God by an act of ours to offer up any thing to God (of meer humane composition) which hath been once offered in an idolatrous service, especially when our Brethren say unto us, This hath been so offered; That the worship of the Church of Rome is idolatrous, grossly idolatrous, we hope no sober Protestants will deny, their Veneration of Images, Adoration of the Eucharist, Invocation of Saints are all Idolatries. Some of these are done as oft as their Mass-book is used; so that their worship, *toties quoties*, as it is performed, is idolatrous, though not in every part, yet in the complex.

III. We do observe how some Prelatists since this point of the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, they can grant (with much ado, we believe) that the worship of the Church of Rome is in some sense idolatrous; what their sense is we cannot tell, nor care to enquire, we believe, that, except some few Pagans who might terminatively worship the Sun and Moon, as thinking those noble Creatures

Creatures were the very *first movers* and *principles*. That never any heathens were guilty of more *stupid foolish idolatry*, than the *Papists* are. For (let vain persons talk what they please) it will never enter into our thoughts that either the *Jens*, *Jerubbaan*, or *Adichael*, thought their Images the first principles of life and being, (such as reason teacheth to all that God must be) nor yet that the Egyptians,

—*quibus nascebantur in herbis*  
—*Nunius.*

(who worshipped any plants, or any thing, from which they had good or hurt (thought that these things were God. They only dreamt that God was *Anima mundi*, the Soul of the World, informing every living thing, and worshipped an *unknown God* in the creature, or by some created representation, (which is yet gross and accursed idolatry) and such is the Popish Worship.

IV. We are not so silly, as to think, that the *holy Scriptures* (dictated by the Spirit of God) or any thing else of *purely Divine Institution*, is capable of corruptions, and therefore cannot but with some laughter read the argumentations of them, who argue, that if we reject the *Liturgy*, because the idolatrous *Papists* used it, we must also refuse the *Scriptures*, and the *Lords Prayer*; these are but toys, to blind common people, who cannot see to the bottom of an Argument. The *holy Scriptures* are incapable of pollution by any idolatrous service.

V. Dr. Cause-  
don on the  
Lords prayer.

V. Their answer is as silly, who tell us, that then we must use none of our *Churches*. When we offer up *Churches to God* by any *rational act* we will consider of this frivolous answer, which indeed may concern them that dream of a holiness in them, by reason of *dedication* or the like: it concerns not us, who only use them as convenient places, in which we meet to serve God, and believe them no more holy than any other places, though the Law of Nature obligeth us to keep, and use them decently. We do so by our parlours where we converse with our friends.

VI. Prayer is a piece of Gospel Sacrifice, and by a rational act of our souls to be offered unto God, now whether it be lawful for us, when *the earth is the Lords and the fulness thereof*, whereas God hath given us an ability, to speak words in another form; to take those very forms, and so offer them up to God in true Gospel worship, which have been offered in an *idolatrous service* (though the matter



matters of those forms be not idolatrous) is to us a great doubt; nor can we be satisfied in the lawfulness of it.

VII. The ground of our scruple is in that known Text 1 Cor. 10. where the Apostle treateth concerning the lawfulness of eating meats, that had been once offered to Idols. He determines as to a double case. 1. *That it is not lawful to eat such meats in an Idols Temple.* a. In case it be sold in the *shambles*, and we know it no, he determines, that we may *buy and eat it*. But in case our Brother saith *unto us, this hath been offered to an Idol*, he saith, *Eat it not*. So that our Brethrens scandal upon such a foundation is to be avoided by us, he gives the reason, because there is *other meat to eat. The earth is the Lords, and the fulness thereof.*

VIII. For our part, we are not able to fathom a reason, why a *form of words fitted up for use in prayer*, should not be liable to the same corruption, and pollution that a *dish of meat fitted for natural use is*: or why should it be unlawful for one to eat the latter, (if once offered in an idolatrous service, our Brother minding us of it) and it yet be lawful to use a form of words in prayer (so formerly used) when our Brother is so scandalized.

IX. We are aware of what the *Drr. of Aberdeen* said of old to prove that the *scandal of brethren, weighs light, when put in the scale with the command of Authority*. There may something be said for their *Affertion*, where the scandal is meerly *passive*, and hath no foundation in *re*, only men are offended, because they are offended: but where the scandal is such, as is so far allowed by Scripture, that a *Negative precept* is given upon it, *eat it not*, we are not of so easie a faith, as to believe what they say, when Gods word saith, *do it not*; Man cannot oblige our conscience to do it, he may oblige us to suffer, but not to act; and that this is the case is evident. Our Brethren say to us, *These Forms have been offered up in an idolatrous service*, and we know this is truth.

X. The *Bishop of Exeter* is mistaken therefore in suggesting, that we forbear the using of the *Liturgy out of a little point of reputation*, amongst some people (rather weak than wise, and to be pitied more than imitated, and he shews little charity, or candor in saying, we sacrifice our judgments (not to say our consciences) to our credits, and out of a fear or lothness to offend some people, whom we might easily convince and satisfie as well by our examples, as by arguments, &c. This is not spoken like a tender and a good Christian. We hope we can say, we value our reputation at a low rate in comparison

of

of our duty. Nor do we think *non-conforming* the way to *credit* now, but that our peoples souls (of which we confess we are tender) are *more weak than wife*, we cannot say. Wisdom lies in avoiding sin, yea, the least sin, and *all appearance of evil*. That here is an *appearance of evil* no reasonable person can deny, it is not so clear that we may do that as to *forms of prayer*, which the Word expressly forbids us *as to a piece of meat*, nor is it so clear to us, that we may *obey man*, in any case, where the Word of God saith as to the thing commanded: *Do it not*.

XI. In the mean time we think those *are to be pised*, who had rather that their brethren should be all *persecuted, imprisoned, banished*, together with those *thousands* of godly people, (who cannot in conscience worship God *with these forms* :) differences in the Church perpetuated, and that so many thousands of sober people, should have such a temptation, to entertain hard thoughts of their Magistrate, &c. In short, who had rather confound *heaven and earth*, and scandalize all *Christians* in the world, than lay aside *forms of prayer* of pure humane composition, and that in most corrupt times, and only retained upon the *reformation* to quiet peoples spirits, and which (in their own confession) have for 6. or 700 years before the Reformation, run through the filthy sink of the *Romish Synagogue*. When God hath himself told them, *That the earth is his, and the fulness thereof*. And therefore expressly charged us not to use a piece of meat once offered to idols, when our brother tells us it hath been so polluted.

XII. But it may be some of our Fathers, or Brethren (what ever a company of us *Puritans* do) do not think the Church of *Rome* an *idolatrous Church*, nor her worship *idolatrous*, we have heard of divers that have lately questioned it. We confess for those *Protestants* that are of that mind, our Argument upon this head signifies little to them, but we are of another mind in the principle, and therefore 'tis no wonder we have different thoughts of the Consequents. In the mean time, those who believe the Church of *Rome* *idolatrous*, have reason to think of this Argument: Those who judge her yet an *undefiled Virgin*, we suppose may have a desire to be married to her. And we shall hardly be able to forbid the banes.

XIII. When the *Bishop of Exeter* can satisfy us, That the *worship of the Church of Rome in the whole Complex is not idolatrous*, Or that it is lawful for us, to take *Forms of Prayer of meer humane composition*.

composition so used in an idolatrous service; and yet continue them in the true worship of God. God's Word saying to us, as to meat so used, *Eat it not*. Or that it is lawful for us to tell our people (when they come and tell us, Sirs, *They say this is taken out of the Mass-book, will you use it?*) No brethren 'tis not taken out there, when we know it is. I say, when his Lordship can satisfy us in these things, he may then conclude (which as yet he doth very uncharitably) *That we might easily convince and satisfy our people, as well by our Examples as Arguments*. Our people are a plain kind of Country people, that are not to be satisfied with a flourish of high words, they have their Bibles, and having so plain a Scripture by the end, as that of 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Eat it not*, they choke us with such things as these. Is not the *Romish Church* idolatrous? have not they used the same forms in their idolatrous devotion? how can you then use them without sin? So that we profess we cannot answer them. We desire the *Bishop of Exeter* would do it plainly and solidly.

## CHAP. X.

*The Ministers third Reason, Because they have sworn to endeavour a Reformation in worship, and to endeavour to Expunge Superstition, and what hindreth the power of Godliness.*

I. **B**ut further yet to let the *Bishop* know, that it is not out of a meer *Anti-Liturgical humour* that some of us (taking the advantage of his Majesties Declaration, and laying hold of his Grace and Favour in it) do not yet meddle with the *Book of Common-Prayer*. We desire his Lordship to consider, *That we have taken the Covenant*, and are afraid to bring upon us that vengeance, which we are sure first or last will follow perjury. If his Lordships loosing *St. Peters bands*, could have loosed our Consciences from that, we had been a step nearer then we are, but we observe no truth of Divinity in the *Principles*, which his Lordship, and others, have laid down; from which they would conclude, that the bond of that *Covenant* is dissolved; we also discern, his Lordship, and the others abundantly answered by *Mr. Crofton*, and *Timoreus*, and could wish that when any of them write again upon

that Subject, they would not only assert positions, but give their reasons which may evince the truth of them, or else annex some Scriptures to prove them; or at least tell us, what Divines were ever of their mind.

II. We have in the Covenant sworn to endeavour a *Reformation of the Church of God in England, in worship according to the word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches.* We think the *worship of God in England*, is, as to the *Rule and Form* of it, expressed in the *Common-prayer-book*, and the *Forms of devotion* there expressed and imposed: We cannot find that either according to the *Word of God*, or the *example of the best Reformed Churches*, it is lawful for the *Ministers of the Gospel* to tie up themselves to *Forms of Prayer*, nor that such practise is commended to us: nor can we conceive how the use of the *same Forms of Worship* should be a *Reformation in Worship*. Nor (possibly) is it clear to every one, that there is nothing in those forms of worship favouring of *Superstition*, or that the use of them is consistent with the promoting of the *power of Godliness*; at least, that it is a due means to promote it, all which we have solemnly sworn to *endeavour*; and surely that *endeavouring* to which we are sworn, will at least oblige us not to do any thing to the contrary.

III. Into which *Covenant*, many *Ministers of the Gospel* having entred, since they used the said forms of prayer; something may be said on their behalf, disobliging them from a return to their former practise, though in these last 20 years' time, they have learn'd nothing from the many books published to the world, examining the said forms in *special*, or offering arguments against *imposed forms in the general*, convincing them of a former inadviseness & error in practise. If they then looked upon the use of those Forms as *indifferent*, surely the *Oath* they have taken puts it into another capacity. If they now judge the *use unlawful*, (it is no great wonder, considering how much light hath shone upon the world in that space of time, that some of their judgments should be altered) the *Bishops* charge of *Schismatical pertinacy, restiveness, morosity, &c.* cleaves not to them.

IV. If the *Bishop* sayes they had before subscribed to use it: According to his *Lordships Doctrine*, & some others of his mind, *forced engagements* signifie nothing. It is true the *Godly Ministers of England* are of another mind, they believe, though they were under a force, (either they must subscribe, or lose their  
lively.

livelyhoods, yea lose the exercise of their Ministry) yet they are obliged by their Act; in case it doth not appear to them, *That it is sinful for them to do what they inadvisedly do their hands to;* but that is the case. Besides, though they cannot think that any Earthly power can discharge them of an Oath made to God, yet they believe that the *Parliament of England* can discharge them of an Engagement entred to an inferiour Magistrate, and by Oath again bind them to do the contrary; and that's the case again.

V. If any say, *That the Ministers of England are bound by the Law of England to use the Common-Prayer-Book.* Besides that it is a great question how far the Laws of a Nation can oblige the conscience in matters of Divine Worship, and most certain, that they cannot oblige any mans conscience, to do any thing in the worship of God, that is, either directly, or by consequence forbidden there, we make it a great question whether the Common Prayer book be established by *Law* or *no*, and believe the contrary. That the *Common-Prayer-book* 5 & 6 *Edw. 6.* with some alterations made 1 *Eliz. 2.* was so established we know, but what that book was, or where it is, we cannot tell; it is apparent that the books ordinarily walking up and down are not so established.

VI. Suppose it were, we do not think that this is pleadable in the case, against the *Covenant* agreed by *Lords* and *Commons* legally assembled in Parliament, and so far ratified by the King, as unquestionably in conscience would suffice to discharge any that shall keep it; (though contrary to some former *Act of Parliament.*)

VII. Nor can it enter into our thoughts, that the *Parliament*, or any Power under Heaven, can by any Future Act, discharge us from the obligation of an Oath; for our parts, those *Divines* that talk any such things, seem to us little acquainted, either with the Word of God, or with the Nature of an Oath. Nor with the former, for God expressly *Numb. 30.* determines the Oath *established for ever*, if the husband of the wife, or Father of the child, either at first consented, or did not presently dissent, but hold his peace: nor with the latter, for all *Divines* determine it, in the power of men to ingage men in an Oath to God, but not in their power to discharge them again, because the Oath makes us debtors to God, & it belongs to God alone to discharge us; which especially holds, where the matter of the Oath is such as Gods Law required, and for which an Oath is only a security,



and certainly such is the matter of *Reformation*, and the rooting out of *Superstition*, and the promoting the *power of Godliness*. The Powers of the world in such a case may contract guilt to themselves by forcing such as fear an Oath, to *suffer*, because they durst not violate their *Oath*; but they can never lay hold on mens Consciences by any Act of that nature, so as to make them sinners, if they do not *actively obey*. Nay it is far better in such cases, and in all cases, to *obey God rather than men*.

## CHAP. XI.

*Other Reasons why divers Ministers are not satisfied, as to the use of the Book of Common Prayer.*

I. Certainly in reason, if a *Liturgie* or Form of Prayer be commended to any Church, it should be such a well composed and compleatly digested Pattern of Prayer, as should contain in it the sum of all things to be ordinarily *confessed* or *begged*, or for which *thanks* should be *given*; and this drawn up, in such plain expressions, as should be obvious to every hearer, and yet so handsomely, as should reconcile the hearers reverence and attention to it. The *Confession* should be of the guilt of all *Original sin*, as well *originaus* as *ariginatum*; the guilt of *Actual sins*. The *Petitionary* part should consist of *Petitions*, for a *fight* and *sense* of sin, *Faith*, *Justification*, a *sense* of it, *Regeneration*, &c. And all these should be in such a form, as no Hearer should have a reasonable Exception to.

II. Thus we are sure it would best fit two (if not the only) ends for which there can be any pretence of the necessity of a Liturgy.

1. The *acquainting* of people with the *Doctrine* of the Church, as to things necessary to be believed, and the *prevention* of *Errors*.
2. The *helping* the *weakness* of ill accomplished Divines; who are not able *ex tempore* so to pray in a Congregation, by which means possibly their people never hear a just *Confession* of *sins*, nor put up perfect *Supplications*.

III. Now it is possible that if the Bishop of *Exeter* (who hath indeed a rare art at words) may have liberty to comment upon our *Liturgie*, he may prove, that such as understand as much as himself,

himself, may from our *Liturgy*, fancy such a perfection of Form, and by Arguments and far-fetched consequences, make out all these; but surely none can say, that take the *ordinary Prayers* appointed to be read every *Morning Prayer*, or *Evening Prayer*, they do contain all things requisite to be *confessed* or *petitioned* for, in so plain and familiar expressions, that ordinary people can understand, that in those Prayers we confess the guilt of *Adams sin, original sin, &c.* or *petition* for such things as are absolutely necessary: Nay we believe that if they did, some that are great Zealots for the use of them, would not so well like them.

4. Besides that the *matter of some things* in the *Liturgy* is not in our judgments so approvable; we do not understand with what truth we can say to God *eight daies together* that he sent his Son to redeem us, [*as on that day*] nor yet as to any one particular day. Nor yet how we can pray in faith to be deliver'd from *Lightning, Tempests* and *sudden death*; we understand how we may pray in Faith to be delivered from the evil of these temporal judgments, and from the judgments themselves (*if it be the Lords Will, &c.*)

V. We by experience find, that the *Form* of the Service prescribed in the *English Liturgy*, is such, to which the *Spirits* of sober people are no waies *reconcilable*; who cannot understand what foundation is either in Scripture or right reason, for the using *particular Prayers* for each day, or dividing the *entire Service* of God betwixt *Ministers and People*, or for using so many *shreds*, or *ends* of Prayer, or repeating the *Lords Prayer* so often. Nor can we our selves be more satisfied with it. Mr. *Sparrowes Rationale* in this case to us seems to have as little reason in it, as *Durantus* his *Rationale* hath for all the superstitious usages of the idolatrous Synagogue of *Rome*.

— Et cantare pares, & respondere parati.

Neither of the Barrels have in it better Herrings.

VI. Now for us (being so graciously indulged by his Majesty) to scandalize all those people whom we must scandalize, seemeth to us not lawful, considering how tender St. Paul was of giving offence to brethren (how light a matter soever be now made of it) especially considering the observation which we make, which we cannot say is universally true, but as to our congregations is generally true, and that is this; That many of the persons offended at

our.

our forbearance of the *Liturgy*, are not of the *stricter* but the *looser* sort of *Professors*, such as his *Majesty* hath justly stigmatized in his *Proclamation*, as *vicious, prophane and debauched persons, Drunkards, Tavern-haunters, Health-drinkers, Swearers*, not that they are all such, but ten for one we find to be such, and we as generally observe, That those of our *Parishioners*, who fear an *Oath*, who live *chastly, temperately and soberly*, and by any *Rule*, are generally not desirous of the use of the *Liturgy*, where they have a *Minister* of any abilities: But where we have any persons, that give up themselves to strict exercises of Religion, that *pray in their Families, exercise themselves in the Scripture*, and have any great knowledge of them, we find them generally impatient of it: Now we cannot think it lawful for us, to scandalize the far greater number of strict *Christians*, that we may gratifie a few others, in whose lives we find nothing, but what is a far juster scandal to all good men, then a godly *Ministers* forbearing the use of the *Liturgy* can be to them.

VII. Especially also considering, that we see that that sort of people who are so zealous for the *Liturgy*, so dote upon it, that it is clearly become their *Idol*, they think there is no serving of God without it, no need of any serving of God but *wish* it: With many people we see it demonstrably true, that if a *Minister* should never preach the Word of God, yet if he did but read the *Common Prayer*, it would be enough. The *Preacher* makes their heads to ake. Now we cannot judge it lawful for us upon this view of the state of our people, to nurse them up in these conceits, which are hardly *Christian*.

VIII. Yet it might go far with us, if one of forty of those people that are so fond of the *Liturgy*, could but give us a reasonable account, why they desire we should pray by *Forms*, rather then *without*, why by *these Forms* rather then others. We do not think it lawful for us to satisfy the irrational humours of people, contrary to our light.

IX. By all this, the *Bishop of Exeter* may see, that we have something to say for our selves, why we do not use the *Liturgy*: Not to enter into a particular examination of the parts of it, the woful Translations of Scripture in it, the *irrational cutting of verses* from verses, Chapters from Chapters, with a 1000 other things, would we examine it in parts, which hath been already done by many: We profess our selves for these Reasons to forbear it,  
and

and to judge our selves obliged in conscience to forbear it. We acknowledge it in his *Majesties* and *Parliaments* power to punish us for that forbearance: If they shall think fit to inflict any punishment in that case, we acknowledge it our duty to suffer patiently, committing our souls unto God, as to a faithful Creator: In the mean time, we are humbly thankful to his *Majesty* for declaring, that *none of us shall be punished for the not using of it*, (at least not for a time.) We do not forbear because His *Majesty* gives us leave, but we forbear out of *Judgment* and *Conscience*, and bless God, who hath put it into the heart of his Most Excellent *Majesty*, to forbear punishing of us for *Conscience sake*, as to this matter of our God. It is therefore a spiteful and odious representation, which B. *Gauden* hath made of us, which hath no foundation of Truth, nor mixture of Charity. God grant him better Interpreters of his actions, and require him not according to his dealing with his Brethren, who desire to *fear the same God* which he professeth to own. *Happy is he that condemneth not himself in what he allows.*

We shall shut up this Discourse with a summary Recapitulation of what Reasons are scattered in the preceding Sheets, justifying our practise in the forbearance of the use of the Common-Prayer.

---

## CHAP. XII.

### *A Summary Recapitulation of the Ministers Reasons.*

I. **W**E cannot believe that it is lawful for us, at all times, by limiting our selves to a *Form of Prayer*, to smother the Gift of Prayer, given (we hope) to some of us, or to cool the heat and fervency of our hearts in Prayer, or the Affections of them that hear us.

II. Because we can find no Precept for it in Gods Word, no Pattern of it there, but one (pretended) *Form*, that made by Christ himself, although we doubt whether ever it were intended for a *Form of Prayer* or no, and rather think it a direction for the matter of Prayer; one Evangelist saying no more, than *after this manner*, Christ and his Apostles leaving no Record of their using of it; nay few of the

the *entire phrases* in it to be found in other Scriptures. (Dr. *Causabon* in his late Book, is miserably put to it to parallel the *phrases* of it, as any indifferent Reader will judge) yet it being holy Scripture, we doubt not but we may use it in the Form, which is so short, as we may easily get it by heart, and not employ our souls (at our eyes in reading) while they should be wrestling with God: And the divine authority of it is such, as it hath another manner of influence on our Spirits in using (as all the Scripture hath) then can be pretended for any other Forms: And by the length of it, we easily understand, that it was never intended to be used without any other Prayer, to say nothing of many other Arguments might be used for that.

III. Because we cannot find, that *there was ever any Forms of Prayer used in the Church, in any part of it till 400 years (or very nigh) after Christ*, nor any made (for more then some single Province) till 600 years, and then by that superstitious wretch Pope *Greg.* and not imposed till 800 years after Christ, when all manner of corruption was brought in; and we challenge all our adversaries, to prove what they say to the contrary of this in any Christian Church: For what Dr. *Causabon* saith, of Forms of Prayer used by the Heathens to their Idols, and by the Jews in their most corrupted, depraved estate, it deserves no Answer.

IV. Because we cannot *imagine any use at all of them, or any good they ever did, especially when imposed*. They were first invented to cure the negligent and ignorant Clergy; to prevent *Heresie* and *Schism*; we have shewed, that in stead of this, they have made an ignorant and negligent Clergy, that they are neither a scriptural, nor rational means to prevent *Heresie*, that they have been the Mothers of *Heresies*, causing separations, and constantly brought forth dreadful persecutions, and will do so still in reason.

V. Because we cannot think it *lawful in the worship of God, to use forms of Prayer* (which are compounds made by men) which have once been offered in an Idolatrous Service (such as is that of the Church of *Rome*) (Dr. *Caus.* saith nothing, in telling us, the Scriptures are in the Mass-book, they are no humane compositions, nor capable of defilement: Though in these Forms there be no Idolatry, yet they have been used in a Service grossely idolatrous. There the Question lies; not whether we may use nothing which hath been offered to Idols, or in an Idolatrous Service? That's a foppery to dream: but, whether it be lawful for Christians in the spiritual worship of God,

by



by a rational act of theirs, in devotion to offer up what is of pure humane composition, and so may be altered, and which hath been before desfiled, by being offered in an Idolatrous Service abhorred of God. Let our Brethren speak to this Question, and leave speaking to other things, as our using the same Scriptures and Temples; For the latter, they know so did the Primitive Churches, which yet never used the Pagan Forms of words. This is not to speak *ad idem*.

VI. Because we have sworn to endeavour a Reformation in Worship, and the Extirpation of Superstition, and what is contrary to, or may hinder the power of godliness.

VII. Because of the infinite scandal which we must give some of our brethren that durst not use it, and to thousands of our most judicious, holy, strictly living Christians and we durst not offend those little ones though we dare leave our Ministry, if authority will command one or the other.

VIII. Because we see the number of those who are judicious, sober Christians who desire it, is very small, but the generality of those given up to all manner of looseness, prophaneity, and debauchery, are impatient for it, and rest in it ('tis as the Papists Bells to them) and they care for no other worship of God, and we conceive it far from our duty, to harden any in what we know is their sin and wickedness.

IX. Because we are assured in our consciences, that very many of those in our ordinary congregations who are earnest for it, press the use of it upon no other account, than from a principle of malice against godly Ministers and people, and desire it for nothing else, but that they may have a weapon to destroy all religious persons by; this is evident by experience, when some Ministers have used some part, they are yet as zealous to turn them out, finding fault, they do not read all; then, he doth not wear the Surplice; he doth not pray the Canon Prayer; he doth not say later service. Nor can we get of them any reason why they desire we should use it, only it is established by Law, (which we cannot believe) if it were, we think in matters of Gods worship something else must be considered.

X. Because the Forms appear to us very short of a perfect Model of prayer, full of obsolete words, dubious phrases, antique responds, and such a Method (though the whole) as is like to none in any Reformed Church in the world, nor any where to be paralleled, but in the Roman Missal, nor any way suited to the spirits of Christians, nor to the gravity of the duty: We do not say this is so, but to us it appeareth so, and therefore it is *quæstio*.

XI. Finally, we do not conceive the Interest and concern of words

in Prayer *such*, that there is any need at all, that *Forms* should be stareht up for all to use, those being best, which the best affected heart emitteth, and venteth, and which best affects the hearts of others: If all Ministers be not able to pray decently enough, (as to expressions) and suitably enough, as to the Matter, it is because the *Governours* of the Church take not that due cognisance of Ministers abilities, which they ought to do before they ordain and admit them; or do not so watch over their Churches as they ought to do. Let then the Error be mended, by the greater care and Vigilance of Church-Governours, not by the restraining the gifts of God bestowed on any, for the sake of some.

XII. This is the sum of our Apology, which we humbly submit to the judgement of all that are concerned in the great affairs of the Church, alwayes reserving to our selves further liberty of adding further Arguments or Exceptions, professing our selves most heartily willing to hear any Arguments of our Brethren, either of *Forms of Prayer*, to be universally imposed, or for these *Forms in particular*, to which we shall give a reasonable Answer, or yield our Cause. In the mean time, we protest against D. *Causabons* uncharitable judgement of us, That we do it to oppose our Brethren. We can, we dare do nothing against the truth, but are ready to do all for it. But we dare not resist the Light of our Consciences. And if it be the will of God, that for our conscience sake in this thing, we be laid aside as *useless vessels*, we humbly submit to his pleasure, who is able of *Stones* to raise up children to Abraham; and we shall pray that our Brethren may have nothing on our behalf charged upon their souls in the day of Christ. In the mean time, what D. *Gauden* hath said, we will further consider in a few words in the following Chapters.

---

#### CHAP. XIII.

*The most of Bishop Gaudens Arguments for the use of the Lytury, examined, and shortly answered; some of them retorted, proving Violentum's in Logick.*

I. **D**R Gauden hath so perplexed his discourse with words, and been so careless of Method, that we have found it no easie thing to pick out his Arguments; we could have wished, that like a *Logician* and *Divine*, he had proposed his Arguments strictly, and followed them closely: that we might have judged that his Design was with a *strength of Argument*, in the *Spirit of meekness*, to convince us,  
over:

over whom he so provocatively insults, not merely to confound his Reader with a non-significant Rhodomantado of Phrase.

I I. So far as we can gather, he one while argues for a *Liturgy*, by and by for this *Liturgy*, and for no other; for which he one while argues, from the *Obligation of the Law*, another while, from the *Obligation of the Example of the Primitive Churches*, or of *some Persons now living*; By and by he urgeth the use of it from *Gratitude to his Majesty*, and from the contrary evidence of *Ingratitude, Morosity, Peccishness, &c.* in case of Refusal. One while he pretends an incomparable excellency in it, another while, the *unblameableness* of it; Anon he runs a descant upon the *confusions of our Church* since it was neglected. After this, he tells us of the *Necessity* of it, the necessity of a *Liturgy* for the *planting of any Church*, this *Liturgy*, for the *defending of our Church against Popery*. One while he urgeth it, that we might be conformable to our *Prince*; another while, that we may be *loyal*. He tells us of the *Authority of the Church*, as to *Liturgy, Ceremonies*, what not? He justifies not only the *Forms of Prayer*, but also the *Method, the Responds, yea, the Musick, the Ceremonies, the Catechism in the Common Prayer-Book*; One while he tells us, that *men have served God day and night in the use of the Liturgy*, yea, that he is persuaded *St. Paul himself* (had he been alive) would have used it; another while, he tells us, how *some Ministers and people have bewailed the neglect of it*.

O quo te teneam mutantem Protea vultu?

The Dr. had made our work shorter and more methodical, if he had told us, which of these he accounts *arguments* in the case, and which he looked upon as strains of *Rhetorick* only, as to which we needed not to have troubled our selves with an answer; he not doing this, we must examine them all, supposing that the Dr. took all these for *conclusive arguments* in the case able to command reasonable and religious souls to this conformity.

III. For the pretended *Antiquity of Liturgies*, his Lordship may gather from what is already said, that we do not believe any such thing, nor hath he spoke one word to prove it, we living not in *Pythagoras* his school, have not learned to submit to an *arbitrary* *Yea*, we desire him to shew us any authority for a *Liturgie* within the first three *Centuries*.

IV. As to what he saith, p. 2. that his most *Sacred Majesty* in his *gracious Declaration* hath not dispensed with the *legal, moral, obediential Obligation*. We conceive he means the obligation which lies upon mens consciences to observe the *Civil Laws of the Nation*, we do not else understand his meaning.

I 2

If

*A Discourse of Lyrurgies,*

If this be it, the Dr. hath two things to do; 1. To prove that the *Common-prayer Book* (vulgarly to be had) is established by any Law of England. (we heard it was openly denyed in the house of Commons in the last Parliament, and we cannot find any Law to that purpose, the Laws, 1 Ed. 5. & 6. Ed. 6. & 1 El. are such that our consciences tell us, they daily violate the Law that read these books.) In the mean time we ingenuously confess, That his Majesties declaration, as it cannot make an obliging Law; so it cannot dissolve the obligation of it: but where is the Law? 2. If it could be found, how far doth it oblige any mans conscience? certainly not to any act of sin; if we thought we could use these forms without sin, we should never dispute the Law in the case, but freely obey the least intimation of his Sacred Majesties pleasure.

V. For what he tells us p. 8. of the example of the Church since the first Century, we can find no such thing. We have said enough to that c. 3. It is an empty unproved Assertion, though we know nothing but Gods word obliging our consciences, and are to learn that any examples oblige us (but those of Christ and his Apostles) and therefore for what he tells us p. 3. of some Ministers that have all this time used the *Lyturgy*: Others that lately have reassumed the use of it: it signifies nothing to us who live by the unerring rule of Scriptures precepts and preidents. If others will sin, surely it obligeth not us to do so too: Though we dare not say they did, or do sin in it.

VI. He urgeth it upon us next from an ingenuous Argument, viz. *Gratitude to his Majesty for his indulgence*, To which we answer, that we with all humility acknowledge His most Excellent Majesties gracious indulgence in it, and in point of gratitude, are willing to serve his Majesty with all that is dear unto us (our souls only excepted which we know he desireth not) in token of thankfulness to his Majesty, we are ready to part with any part of our livelihoods, and shall in that vie with those who pretend most to his Majesty's service, (though many of us in severall places have no benefit by his Majesties declaration, whilst some eager Lawyers and Justices still give the Statutes in charge against us, and cause us to be indicted and prosecuted, openly telling the people that the Kings declaration is no Law, though they also know that there is no Law for the *Common-prayer*) yet we have an experiment of his gracious Majesties good will to us his poor subjects; and shall be willing by any way, which our consciences tell us would not be sin to us, to let his Majesty know our gratitude. But we are sure that his Majesty is more charitable to his peoples souls then to desire that to express their thankfulness to him they should

com-

commit the least sin against God. And this is enough to excuse us from the Bishops rash charging us with *Morosity*, *Reserve*, *Prejudice*, *Schismaticall petulance*, &c. with none of which men can be charged for any action which they do, or neglect, that they may avoid the guilt of sin before God, whether their consciences inform them rightly or no.

VII. For the many Splendid words, which the Bishop useth p. 23. 31. to dazzle peoples eyes at the apprehension of the *Excellency of the Liturgy*, they are of no use at all, for besides that if he would have made his words good, he must have proved 1. *That the Common-prayer hath in it a perfect Confession of such sins as all are guilty of. Original, Actual, of Omission, Commission*, a perfect summary of things necessary to be begged of God for all; and a perfect form of thanksgiving for mercies received, and all this expressed in most significant Scriptural Language, plain, and affective expressions, and cast into a lovely and usual method, I say besides this, the *Excellency of no form of words in prayer*, can commend it to be imposed universally, if such imposing be not lawful. But instead of this the Bishop gives us a parcel of fine words without a tittle of proof, and contrary to the generall apprehension of all Reformed Churches, (who never speak it more then tolerable) and to the judgment of discretion; which the Protestant Religion allows to all private persons: so that this is but *αὐτὴ ἡ δόξα* one Drs. opinion, which to us Protestants is not enough to make what he sayes, a probable *Doctrine*.

VIII. What he argues for it, from the *invalidity of the exception taken to it*, and the *supposed unblameableness of it*, signifies as little, for it is blameable enough, as a form universally imposed. 2. As formerly used in an idolatrous service; and for many things which he never so much as in teavours to vindicate it from, though told him of old by Mr. Cartwright, the *Abridgement*; more lately by the book called *Necessity of Reformation*, by *Walter Powel*, &c. besides for what he speaks to, as to the point of *Baptismal regeneration*, it is so without foundation in Scripture (for all know those two Texts. 3. Jo. 5. and in Titus have: other and better senses, So contrary to the *Analogy of Faith* in the point of *Justification*, *Perseverance in grace*, &c. and the Dr. hath said so little to clear it, that those Exceptions will yet stand good; so will that as to the translation of the Text in Ezek. for none is so simple to assert, that we can as infallibly give the sense of a Text. and put it in other words with our additions, as Christ and his Apostles; and sure we are, the Text in Ezek. in the letter of it speaks no such thing as our *Liturgy* makes it to speak.

V. The Common-prayer book unmasked,

V. The Parallel between the Mass-book and the Liturgie.



IX. For what he urgeth as to the *disorders and confusions in our Church since the disuse of the Liturgy*, which he much comments upon, 7, 11, 14. It is no argument to evince the necessity or expedience of bringing back the *Liturgy* again, because not the want of it, but rather the too long having of it, was the cause in a great measure. For, 1. *In what congregations were these confusions most ordinary?* was it in those Congregations where the *Liturgy* was out of choice laid aside? which were furnished with godly learned Ministers? we appeal to the Citizens of London whether they took notice of any such *extravagancies* in their Ministers? nor can malice it self so charge them. But there were two other sorts of Preachers: 1. There was an *old Set* who had so used themselves to the *Liturgy*, that they had lost *all their gifts*, and being restrained in the use of those forms, and not having a *spirit* or *heart* suited to their work could do just nothing. 2. There was another Set of *Lay-preachers*, and *raw young Students* got into livings, many of whom were also corrupted in their judgements, and it is no great wonder some of them should be justly chargeable. The question is, what such confusions there would have been, had none been admitted into livings but such as were duly qualified.

X. Above all things we wonder, why a form of words in prayer at the administration of the Sacraments, should be judged so highly necessary to be prescribed; for the Sacrament of the Lords Supper as it is an ordinance which requires the greatest preparation, both as to him that administers, and those that receive: so we cannot but think it very hard that any diversion should be offered to the Ministers soul in prayer there, and unreasonable that he should do any thing which might either abate the fervour of his own spirit, or be less affective of his peoples hearts. For the forms of words in consecration and administration, we think it no way fit the Minister should vary a tittle from the institution, where Christ hath left us words sufficient. Nor can we allow the *Liturgies* turning the words to be spoken at the delivery of the Sacrament into a prayer, being no wayes agreeable to the institution. The same is to be said as to the other Sacrament, only if an explicit enumeration of the chief heads of the Doctrine of faith, (to which the Parents assent is required) be judged necessary, we think it warrantable, and should freely allow the Church to prescribe a form there, and to enjoin the observation of the Scriptural form of words in both administrations to be used, and no other.

XI. As to the desires of the most *Learned and Judicious and Godly* of the people, which the *Dr.* mentions p. 7. we see no such thing; but the quite contrary, and dare almost venture it upon the *vote* of such in our Parishes, as are not guilty of noted *debauchery*; and have any form of Religion in their families, and can give us a rational answer why they desire it.

XII. We do freely allow that no Minister ought to oppose his private *Spirits to the Spirit of the Prophets* united: but yet must maintain for every Minister a judgement of discretion, ( which when we have once disputed out of the world, *Papery* will immediately succeed, & nothing remains but *blind obedience* ) we do allow a due honour to some of those Reverend persons that had an hand in composing the *Liturgie*, and do think they did worthily in their generation, according to that twilight of Gospel light, which immediately after a midnight of *Papish darkness* shone out upon them; we do allow them to have done prudently; respecting the state of the English Nation at that time, ( *Rome* could not be pulled down in a day ) but we also know, how imperfect their attainments were, and how gradually they reformed their own judgements. It is sufficiently known that one of the most Eminent of them, ( holy *Cranmer* ) was one of them, who ( at that time himself being a professed protestant ) condemned that rare *Martyr Lambert*, for denying the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. In the witness of which truth in Queen *Maries* dayes himself (upon further light suffered *Martyrdom*. We believe he did both in the sincerity of his heart, and only mention this to shew, that those *Eminent lights* were not fitted to set a standing and perpetual rule to the Church in so great an affair as this is.

XIII. But if as the Bishop saith p. 3. Neither piety nor policy, will allow the *discomposing or dissolving* the whole frame of the *Liturgy*. And if as he tells us p. 12. The Reformed part of Religion cannot be well preserved in England to any flourishing and uniform State, unless such *Liturgie* be authoritatively enjoined, and constantly maintained. Then unquestionably it ought to be as he disateth. And if as he tells us p. 23. The *Liturgie* of England as to the main essentials of it in Doctrine, Devotion, Consecration, and Celebration, for matter, order and method, be such as may not be maimed. If ( as p. 31. ) nothing can ever be seen comparable to this *Liturgie*, if it be null'd and destroyed, and if after is reviewed, it be not by Law, reestablished and authoritatively enjoined, Truth and peace can never be established; there's all the reason in the world that we should have it: better that those thousands of Godly Ministers and people, who cannot submit to it, should be banished the

the Land, then such evils come by hearkening to them, or such good things be hindred by their *non-conformity*. But let us search the bottom of this heap of words, and see what strength of *Reason* there is in them.

XIV. He gives three reasons for his former assertion, *That it is against piety and policy to alter it.*

1. *It would reproach the wisdom, and blemish the piety of the first composers of it.*

2. *It would imprudently disparage the judgement and devotion of the whole Church of England.*

3. *It would much damp and discourage the present zeal and devotion of the greatest & chiefeſt part of this Nation, who are much pleased and profited by the use of it.*

*Ergo*, The alteration is against Piety and Policy.

XV. For the first, We would be loath either to reproach the *Piety*, or blemish the *wisdom* of the first Reformers; but we cannot understand how the one or the other should be reproached, by not imposing a *Liturgy*, or not imposing this *Liturgy*. Was the *Wisdom* of God reproached by the disuse of the *Ceremoniall Law*, which yet was an excellent *Schoolmaster* to bring the *Jewes* to *Christ*? Or is the wisdom or prudence of *William Lilly* or any other Master of Grammar reproached, because when the Boy comes to be Master of Arts, he no longer makes *Latine* by *Grammar Rules*, nor further useth it then at a pinch now and then? Certainly those first Reformers did like *wise* and *pious men*, with respect to their age, the complexion of the People, the abilities of the then-Ministers. But if that we have not improved both in *Reformation* and in all *Gifts*, very much since that time (now 100 years) we have woefully abused our mercies. And it is the honour of our first Reformers, that by their means who first translated the *Service-Book* into English, &c. there are so many thousand Ministers to be found now in *England*, who are able to speak unto God before people, as well and orderly, as if they did read those Forms. Is it not so to the *Schoolmaster*, who by dictating Forms of *Theams* and *Epistles*, and *Orations*, teacheth his Boyes to make as good, and better than his were, in 9 or 10 years time? Surely it were rather a reproach to the *Schoolmaster*, so to inure his Boyes to Forms, that when they are Masters of Art, they must still have Forms dictated to them, without which they can do nothing.

XVI. Nor would the alteration of this *Liturgy*, and not imposing any, blemish the judgement of our whole Church, our Kings, Princes, and Parliaments, &c. Their judgement was excellent as to those times.

In

In King Edward his time, the Clergy were generally *Papish*, and had been left to liberty, would certainly have used the *Mass*, or else such person, as were of mean parts, most of them *Anglicæ docti*, such as the necessity of those times required, because better could not be had. In Qu. Elizabeths time, the state of the Nation (at least in the beginning of her Reign) was little better; witness the Record which Archbishop Parker left, (and is yet to be seen in the Library of *Corpus Christi* Colledge in Cambridge) of all the Ministers in his Province, and their several abilities, where are 20. *Anglicæ docti*, such as understood no Latine, for one that hath a Character for any Learning set upon him; this man was Archbishop in the Second year of Qu. Elizabeth. Undoubtedly it was an Act of rare Judgment for the Parliament then to impose *Forms of prayer*, nor was it likely that suddenly the whole Nation would be reformed so well, that with any security or prudence, the Ministers could be left at liberty. Since the time of Qu. Elizabeth no Parliament meddled with it: K. James, indeed reformed it in part, and declared his Judgement for it. K. Charles (of Glorious Memory) in his *Meditation* upon the *Liturgy* (though indeed he judgeth an imposed *Liturgy* lawfull, and this as to the main very good) yet declareth his readinesse to have consented to amend what upon free and publick advice, might seeme to sober men convenient as to matter or manner, by which it appears, that his Majesty judged it capable of amendment both as to Matter and Manner.

XVII. But it is a great Riddale to us, how the removing of the *Liturgy*, and not imposing any universally, should damp and discourage the zeal of the greatest and chiefeſt part of the Nation, who find much pleasure and profit in the use of it. For if it be still left at liberty to them, if they please to use the old Forms, how is their Zeal damped or discouraged, by the liberty which others take? It is a fiery Zeal in men certainly, that must needs have all others to be of their humour, as to the use of *Forms of words* in Prayer. If by zeal, the Bishop means the Fury of people against those who durst not use those Forms, the God of Heaven more damp and discourage that zeal, which we are sure is not according to knowledge. If the greatest and chiefeſt part of the Nation be so zealous in this case, doubtless if they be left to liberty, people will generally fall in with those Ministers that do use it, and there will be an *ingenuum conformity*, which is alwayes best, for a little experience will convince the furious ones of this age, that Religion is a thing that must *instillari*, not *imrudi* (as Bæza sometimes said) a thing to be gently instilled and commended, not bluntly.

bluntly and forcible intruded and compelled. Our *Bishops* in this point may give counsell effectual to the filling of *Goals*, undoing of many thousands, and procuring their cries unto God against them, but never effectual to accomplish their designs, if indeed their designs be to bring all to an uniformity in this thing, but they very well know, that it is left to liberty to Ministers, to use or not use the *Lyturgy*, that experience will quickly make it appear, that the greater part of more knowing zealous people are not so enamoured upon it, as they proclaim them to the world to be.

XVIII. In the next place, he tells us, *The Reformed part of Religion cannot be well preserved in England without it, so any flourishing and uniform estate.* Immediately before, he told us, *Religion could not any where be planted without a Lyturgy*: Both of them, Propositions of equal truth. If Religion could not be planted without a *Common-Prayer-Book*, it is a wonder that the Apostles and Pastors of the *Primitive Churches* missed this only means; for what *Lyturgy* was ever heard of in the Church for 400 years after Christ? (the great planting time) if the *Reformation of Religion* cannot be preserved without a *Lyturgy* imposed, or this *Liturgy*, alas for the Churches of God in Scotland, Holland, France, Geneva! If they have a *Lyturgy*, how unlike is it to this, nor is it imposed, nor the use of it by penalties compelled; yet blessed be God, the *Reformation* in those Churches is no less perfect than ours; nor less firmly preserved: Let their Confessions of Faith be read, or their Printed books against the Papists be read and compared with ours, and let all judge: What singular thing then is there in the Constitution of men & women in England, that religion in its reformed part cannot subsist without the authoritative imposing of a *Liturgy*, taken out of the *Roman Missal* as to the far greater part? Surely none will say, it is because the *Reformed party of England*, have a more reverend opinion of *Pope Gregory* and the present Church of *Rome*, than the *Reformed Party* in other Nations hath: This indeed were a shameful reproach to the Church of England. Let her enemies lay it to her charge, but let her true Sons spend their time in covering such nakedness. We must know the *Bishop's Reasons*, before we can believe any truth in this, especially when we know that those Ministers and people, who are most zealous against *Papery*, are most averse to this *Lyturgy*.

XIX. The Bishop instances in the matter of the *Sacrament*, telling us, *Papery* can never come in while the Form of *Consecration* prescribed in the book of *Common-prayer*, which is most ancient and excellent is used. We must ingeniously confesse, that some Forms of Prayer



Prayer prescribed to be read at the administration of the Lords Supper, are very good and pious; but we are much of his mind, who said, *Nihil ego puto a quovis præscriptum tam exacte quin addi aliquid possit, aut perfectius reddi a quo vis qui ministerio dignus, ad docendum vel movendum affectum, nam facile est addere inveniis & præscriptis, licet forte nihil exactius dari posset, tamen languet oratio, ubi non est verborum varietas, nec præsumunt affectum: teriores orantis aut exhortantis libere in verba.* Nam ut afficiat auditores, oportet ipsam affectum, non autem afficitur ut debet, qui semper eisdem verbis orat, aut exhortatur. It is an usual saying, and may be true enough, *Optimus orator non nondum nascitur.* To say that either for matter or phrase there was never any Prayers made like to those, and that no such can be made, are strange, extravagant, and hyperbolical expressions, by no means either to be justified or demonstrated. In short, those Forms of words in Prayer are undoubtedly best for the *Speakers use*, which come most from the intention of his mind and fervency of his Spirit. As to other joyning with him, those are best, which most affect the hearers hearts. That these, or any Forms upon this we count do so, is not demonstrable. For the *Form of consecration of the Lords Supper in the English Liturgy*, we cannot find any *Form* for it (which we think an *high Omission*) we do conceive, that the Consecration should be by reading the words of institution, taking and breaking the Bread, and then blessing it; We find only a form of Prayer for a blessing upon the Elements, and not so much as a Rubrick directing the Minister at that time to read the words of Institution, or to take and break the Bread. As for the words used in the delivery of the Sacrament, we find them (without any warrant from Gods Word) turned into Prayers: So that the Bishop might have spared the commending of this Part of the Liturgy, where we think is a more considerable Omission of what should be there, than he can instance in our administrations; or then the omission of those words, *Receive the Holy Ghost in ordination* is, especially when we know no such power any Ministers have now to give the Holy Ghost, as the Apostle had, and can easily distinguish betwixt the Apostles ordinary Act in Ordination, and their extraordinary Act in giving the Holy Ghost; to the latter of which, none can now pretend. For the *Ancientry* of these Forms, we have shewed before, they are not of age enough to speak for themselves; and to plead their *gray hairs* for their continuance.

XX. To say, *That without the authorisation impoynt of Acts, or any other Liturgy, Truth and Peace cannot be kept, and that it is necessary*

guessed, nor can there be any pretence for it: Certainly *truth* is far better preserved by a full and sound confession of *faith*, in a form of *sound words*, in which all are agreed; and we should be content to read a short summary of it every Lords day, to subscribe, oon, defend it; that it should be subscribed and sworn by all *Commencees in Universities*, by all to be ordained, or admitted into livings, by all admitted to sacraments; how an imposed *Lyturgy* should do half so much; nay how it should do any thing at all to preserve truth, we cannot guess.

XXI. For *Peace*, we have had the experience of an 100. years to prove the contrary; sure we are that we may thank the *Imposing of the Lyturgy* in former times, for all our *Brownists, Anabaptists, Quakers, Familists, Sectaries* of all sorts. Their Leaders first separated from the Church for the *Common-prayer Book* and *Ceremonies*, then set up for themselves, and being themselves unskilfull in the *Word of Righteousnesse*, easily perverted others. And we are sure that there are now 100. for every one that distasted these things in 1640. both *Ministers* and *people*; how the reimposing should bring us to *Peace* poseth us to prophecy It may bring many thousands of persons to ruin for not conforming, driving them into other lands, giving their malicious adversaries advantages to fill prisons with them; but peace it can never bring.

XXII. We observe that all reformed *Churches*, where are no such imposing of *Lyturgy*, have more plenty of able Divines, (considering the proportion of their ground) more zealous defenders of *Truth*, fewer *Hereticks*, and *Schismaticks*, then ever *England* had at any time when the *Liturgy* was most rigorously imposed. Nor is it reasonable to imagin that we should ever have any peace in the Church, if the former *Lyturgy* be imposed, but continuall separations from the Church, and violent persecutions of those whose consciences for the reasons aforesaid, will never allow them to use it.

XXIII. So that we humbly crave leave to retort this as an *Argument* against the *Imposing*, either this, or any other *Lyturgy*, Its being inconsistent with the peace of this Church. And we most humbly beseech His most Excellent Majesty, the Noble Lords, and the Gentleman of *England*, seriously to consider, Whether there being no command in *Scripture*, nor particular warrant for any imposings of this nature, no president of the primitive Church in any part for 400. years after Christ; there being also such a plenty of Godly able *Ministers* in *England*, So many times ten thousand of Godly Christians, who cannot allow themselves in the worship of God by forms of prayer; and

and who have taken so great a scandall at these forms in particular ; and that for reasons above mentioned : It can consist either with *Piety* in them to enjoyn what is so highly offensive, (when St. Paul professeth so much tenderness to his weak brethren) or with *Policy*, to enjoyn that in which they cannot but know that many thousands will be found who durst not actively Obey, but will think themselves bound to suffer ? So that they will be constrained in pursuance of their honour (commanding such things ) to erect Courts, direct persecutions of persons, only blameable in this matter of their God , and such who are ready by any *Aff* or *Oath* to secure their *Allegiance* to his Majesty, by any *Action* to express it, paying tributes , and customs for conscience sake; dayly praying for all the blessing of heaven for his Majesty , and this with far more cordiality then others drink His health. Or whether such proceeding be like to produce Peace in the Church, or rather everlasting divisions, animosities, and constant prosecutions of sober Christians, concerning the equity of which the Just Judge of the whole earth must one day enquire ? And in the meane time these *Impositions* to be of no further considerable use, then to help ignorant persons unfit for the Ministry, and such as are lazy negligent, and make no conscience to stir up the gift of God in them. We humbly leave this to our Superiours to determine.

XXIV. The questions as to piety are , 1. *Whether pious Magistrates, can according to principles of piety, command and enforce those things, which Gods Word doth not command in his worship, being openly offensive to multitudes of Godly people ? Whether they can acquit their soules to God in making Laws, so fine, disturb, imprison, banish, &c. multitudes of their Subjects for no other crime then this, that they cannot limit themselves to forms of prayer in Gods Worship?* And suppose these two things were consistent with Piety, yet whether Policy would direct it ? is another question; why should so many good Subjects be lost to a Nation? why should they have temptations to estrange their hearts from the ancient and excellent government thereof ? But matters of pollicy, we most humbly leave to the grave wisdom and deliberations of His Sacred Majesty and His Parliaments. Onely we must add a word to one or two Suggestions more, which the Bishop hath for the imposing of the Liturgy.

CHAP. XIII.

*Bishop Gaudens two Arguments, from the Authority of the Church, the influence of Subjects Conformity, in devotion, to their Prince, considered. No necessity of using the Liturgy upon these accounts.*

I. **T**He truth is in other parts of his Book, the *Bishop* did but like the *Lapping* fly far about from his design and argument, which p. 27. he toucheth, and yet but very tenderly, *The Authority of the Church must not be baffled*. Here indeed is the bosome of all, we must have *Liturgies and Ceremonies* imposed, to maintain the *Authority* and pomp, and grandeur of what they call the *Church*.

II. The name of the *Church* is a reverend name, and her authority is reverend, and by no means to be baffled, for *Christ* is in her. But as the *Name* and *Authority* of a rightfull King, is reverend, so both the name and authority of an *Usurper* is justly abominable. And as no *Magistrate* commands to be obey'd where they have no right to command, so neither is any *Church*; nor is denial of obedience in that case any contempt of the *Authority*, either of the *Magistrate* or of the *Church*; we must therefore enquire strictly what *Church* this is which is clothed with *Authority*, and what power she hath in the things we dispute about?

III. The *Church* is either *Triumphant* or *Militant*. The *Militant Church* is visible or invisible. It must be the *Militant visible Church*; this also is an *homonimous* term, and either signifies the universality of the people, or the messengers of the people. The *Universality* of people baptized into the name of *Christ* over all the world, make up the *Catholic visible Church*, The whole Company of them in this or that Province, Nation, City, Parish, make such a *National, Provincial, or Parochial Church*. But we do not think this is the *Church* clothed with *Authority*: We understand by a *Church* in that sense, The *Officers* of such a *Church* constituted according to *Gods Word*, whether they be *Officers* of a particular *Church*, or the messengers of the particular *Churches*, in a *Plangentile Synod*, a *National or Provincial Synod*, or if it were possible in an *Oecumenical Synod*. To *Churches* in all these political senses we owe great reverence, and acknowledge that to their severall capacities, severall degrees

of authority, to *admonish, suspend, excommunicate, deprive, declare the doctrine of faith in doubtful cases, appoint some things truly and properly relating to decency or order, &c.*

IV. But it is more then we know that any such Church as this, ever established a *Lyturgy* in England. The Papists have devised a new notion of a Church, to them the Pope and his Cardinals make the Church; but that any such notion of Church is justifiable from Scriptures, Protestants deny.

V. Our State hath been pleased in some Acts of Parliament to take Church in another notion, and to call the Prelacy of England, the Church of England. That this application of the term Church is not to be justified from Scripture or Reason, is plain; nor is it needful they may if they please, call the Prelacy of England the Parliament; or by what other name they please, what should hinder? But they cannot give them that authority, which the word of God allows only to a Church in another notion; but may cloath them with what civil power they please.

VI. Hence it appears, that it is all one with us in England to baffle or despise the Church and State; for that company of men whom we call the Church of England (by a new civil application of the term) is nothing else, *Then a company of men by a Civil Power made Bishops, and called to advise the State, in things concerning Religion; who have no more Authority then they derive from the King or Parliament; for whence should they have it? Not from Nature; Surely no Ecclesiastical power is derived from thence: Not from Scripture upon any pretence, for if when Christ gave the Keyes to Peter, he intended his single person as the Papists would have it: then St. Peter's successeur only can pretend to them, if he gave them to Peter, as an Officer of the Church; then there must be either a full Convention of officers, or some person chosen by them to use them: If to Peter as a Christian, then the Authority is in the Community.*

VII. It remains, that according to the Constitution of English Synods, the Churches Authority is but derivative from the Civil State, and to disobey them, is no sin, further then it is a disobedience to the lawfull civil Magistrate, to whom we freely grant an authority, so far as Gods word allows us, and such an authority, as none ought to resist or baffle, (as the Bishop says,) The Church of England, which we so often hear of, is a civil Church, not an authoritative Church in a Scriptural notion.

VIII. We again say, Far be it from us to oppose Civil Authority, either exercised by Lay persons or Ecclesiastical persons. We acknowledge



knowledge it our duty to render unto *Cesar* the things that are *Cæsars*. We further say, we are bound to obey the *Civill Magistrate* in all things, in things lawfull, *Actively* : in things unlawfull in themselves, or which appear so to us by *suffering* their will, and pleasure, quietly and patiently. That which we insist upon, is onely a lawfull meanes in order to our own preservation : i. e. humbly desiring the *Civill Magistrate*, to forbear imposing upon us in the tender things of God.

IX. We freely allow to the *Civil Magistrate* a power to command us in all *civill things*, and shall chearfully obey him. 1. To command us to keep the *Statutes, and Commandments of God*. 3. To command us in the *Circumstances relating to divine Worship*, to do those things, which are generally commanded us in the word, to appoint *time and place*, and such circumstances without which the worship of God, in the judgement of ordinary reason, must be indecently and disorderly performed.

X. For his power in imposing *Forms of prayer, significant ceremonies, &c.* we do not dispute it, but we humble crave leave to dissent in this, and to have liberty to suffer his pleasure as becomes *Christians*, rather then do those things which our consciences would condemn us for. And in this we appeal to all sober *Divines*, and all rational *Christians*, whether we speak not as becomes sober *Christians*.

XI. We cannot without some passion read what the *Bishop* sayes p. 28. "doubtless Subjects cannot be so rite an firm, or so zealous and firm, or so chearful and constant in their Loyalty, love, and duty to their Sovereign, if they either think themselves commanded to serve God in a way worse then their Princes use, or that their Sovereign and Prince serves God worse and less acceptable then they do; certainly the greatest honour, love and safety of Kings, is from the sameness of true Religion with their Subjects, as to the main.

XII. What an excellent doctrine this is, if it were true, to engage the *King of France* against all his *Protestant Subjects*, from whom he differs as to Religion in the main? yet are they as loyal to him as any other; doth the *Protestant Religion* teach disloyalty towards Princes, differing from their Subjects in the main of Religion? We defie such Doctrine, and all the assertors of it.

XIII. Doth it infer a difference in the main of Religion, because our *Sovereign* thinks fit to use Forms of Prayer, and we use none? Is this a Language worthy of a Divine? Is the *Mode of worship*, and the *Main of Religion* the same thing?

XIV. How shall they think themselves commanded to use a better or worse Religion, upon whom nothing is imposed at all? which is all we beg; and against which the Doctor argues.

XV. How doth the Prince and his Subjects in this case (the first using Forms of Prayer in publick Devotion, the latter none) more differ in the main of Religion, than the Christians of two Families in a Parish do, where the householders so far differ each from other? Or how shall they differ more upon this liberty, than Dr. Gauden himself allows, who would not have all persons in their Family duties, tyed up to these Forms, which yet are the Kings daily Service in his Household.

XIV. To be short, these Discourses are but *ad populum phalaræ*, Pretensions in which all the judicious world sees there is nothing of Reason or Argument. *Qui vult decipi, decipitur*, If God hath so far given up men, that they cannot see it. But notwithstanding all that is, or can be said, the Servants of God who differ from their brethren in this thing must be brought into a *suffering estate*: The Lord grant them *Wisdom*, and *Faith* and *Patience*, and provide for his people, more able and faithful guides, than we have approved our selves while we had a liberty to work in his Vineyard; and if it be a sinne in any for this reason to forbid us to speak to poor perishing souls *that they may be saved*, we shall be so charitable, as to beg of God, that it may not be *laid to their charge*: But we hope, and pray for better things for the poor souls over whom God hath set us.

## CHAP. XV.

*Bishop Gaudens Arguments for Church Musick examined. The Novelty of Musick in Churches evinced, not in the Primitive Church, not in any Reformed Church, condemned by Aquinas, Erasmus, and by the generalis of Protestant Writers. The Jews no pattern for Christians in it.*

THE Bishop having spent himself much in devising reproachfull terms, for such as are not satisfied in their consciences as to the use of the *Lyurgy*, and arguing for the use of the Forms of Prayer, (that he might leave no part of his work undone) comes to vindicate the *Quiristers*, *Singing men* and *boies*, and the use of *Musick* also in the worship of God. *It is only* *ſe* (he ſayes) *for thoſe mens rudeneſſe to abandon Church-musick, who intended to fill all things with the*

*Alarms of war, and cries of Confusion*: How charitably this is spoken with reference either to the *Purer Primitive Church*, or the lately *Reformed Churches*, or many of his Brethren, the sequent discourse will evince. We durst not render *reviling for reviling*, but commit our case to him that judges *righteously*; and offer our thoughts in this thing to all sober *Readers*, who understand ought of *Ecclesiasticall Story*, or right *Reason*.

II. But by what *Topicks* will this *great person* prove the Lawfulness of Church-Musick? Did this also come from the *first Century*? Surely no. For *Justin Martyr* (who lived in the *Second Century*) let us know, that the Church then judged it a *childish Serving of God*, and it was not received in the Church in his time: His words are these.

Οὐ τὸ ἁσασθῆναι ἐν ἡμετέροις ἀρμυρίων ἀλλὰ τὸ μετὰ τῶν ἀψύχων ἐργάζεσθαι ἁσασθαι καὶ μετὰ ὀρχήσεως καὶ χοροῦ. Διὸ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις προαίρεται ἐκ τῆς ἀσμετῶν ἢ χοροῦ καὶ τοῖς τῶν ὀργάνων ἢ τῆς ἀλλων τῆς νηπιῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀρμόδιον ἢ σοφὸν ἐστὶν τὸ ἁσασθαι. In his time there was only plain *simple singing* used in the Church, and more than that, *viz. with instruments of Musick*, they looked upon as a puerile, carnal Service.

III. Indeed the Bishop fetcheth it high enough; for he agrees with *Durantis*, in making *David* the Author of *Organs*, not pretendeth he any authority but that of the *Jewish Church*. That there was (even by Gods Institution) *musical Instruments* used in the *Jewish Church*, is not to be denied, whether in the *Synagogues*, or only in the *Temple*, is doubted, the latter believed. But what kind of *Musick*, is not certain: Both *Polydore Virgil*, *Hospinian*, and many others agree, our *Organs* were not then known in the world. When they first were found out, *Plydore* sayes is uncertaine; and in his 3 Book, reckons them amongst those things, whose first inventers are not known. Sure we are *Dauids instruments* were stringed *Organs*, *i. e. Instruments*, not such as we call *Organs*.

IV. But may we then agree, that what *David* used in the worship of God, we may; Else the Bishops Argument from *Dauids* use of *Instruments*, proves nothing: Let us then have *Alians* and *Erancincense*, (which saith Mr. Calvin, are every whit as lawful, as *Musical Instruments* in Gods worship.) But surely nothing which was *figurative* and *typicall* in the *Jewish Service*, ought to be continued by us, which their instruments of Musick were; they prefigured our *spirituall melody* to be made in our hearts to the Lord; the sweet *Musick* also of a Conscience justified by Faith, and at peace with God, saith

Pl. Virgil. l. 1  
de inv. rer. c. 15.  
Hospin de Org.  
Temp. l.

Calvin, Psal.  
37.

saith Dr. Willot, and so Zepperus and others agree. But who knows not, that the Jews had carnal Ordinances, (as the Apostles call them, which we must not imitate them in, who John 4. 24. are obliged to worship God in Spirit and in Truth.

Willets Synops.  
P. 193.  
Quere 2 Sam.  
in. Ch. 6. v. 9.

V. It is as uncertain when Organs were first brought into Churches, as when they were first devised. *Marianus Scotus* tells us, that they were first sent of a Token to King *Pepin* in France, in which *Aventinus* agrees, but adds, that they came not into any Church in France, till the year 828. when by the industry of a *Vinegian Priest* (*Ludovicus* then King, and willing to be at the charge) they were there set up. *Baleus* tells us, *Vicellianus* brought them in, An. 660. *Bellarmin* saith, it was very late. What *Baleus* and *Platina* say, that *Vicellianus* brought them in, cannot be true: No, nor what *Almonius* saith, who says that *Ludovicus Pius* brought them in, for it is plain by *Aquinas* his determination, (against the use of any Musick in Churches, as *Judaical* and carnal) that they were not come into the Church in his time, \* which was about 1260 years after Christ (which is also well observed by *Cajetan* upon *Aqu.* and by *Navarrus*, in his *Manuall*, &c.

122  
Aq. sum. q. 91.  
art 2. resp. ad  
3. & 4. arg.  
\* As both *Cajetan*  
& *Greg. de*  
*valentia* ac-  
knowledge.

VI. For the Reformed Churches, they have no Musick in the worship of God: In some of their Churches, (as *Zepperus* notes) they have Organs, to delight people with at ordinary times, when the worship of God is not performed. The Bishop might have been more charitable, both to the Apostolical Church, and the purer Primitive Churches, and all late reformed Churches, than to have determined them guilty of rudeness, and a design to fill all things with the Alarms of war and Cries of Confusion.

VII. Having no Scripture, no Apostolical or Ecclesiastical Tradition (as they pretend for Bishops and Liturgies) to pretend for Church-Musick, the Bishop is forced to make use of his Reason here, the depth of which, as also its Symphony with that of the ancient Fathers, or latter Divines, cometh next to be examined.

VIII. We can find but five pieces of seeming Reason in the Bishops discourse.

1. The Angels began the Quire at Christ's Nativity: He is not in good earnest sure to suggest to the world, that the Angels brought any Musickall instruments down with them from Heaven: If not, his Argument must be; That it is as lawfull for us to praise God in publick Acts of worship, with Instruments of Musick, as for the Angels to rejoice. But how shall that appear? We believe no more that the Angels taught men (by that jubilation) the use of Church-Musick, than the idle Story Secretaries tells us, of *Iguatius* his learning

the Method of *Reffonds*, by a *Vifion of Angels*, answering one another, like fo many *Quirifters*; which as *Hofpinian* and others fay, was not furely fuch a momentous piece of *Worship*, as that God fhould fend *Angels* down to exemplifie it.

IX. But the *Bifhop* tels us, we have as much *caufe to rejoyce*, as the *Jews* had: True. And God forbid but we fhould rejoyce with equal joy: But muft it be in the fame *carnal manner* too? Have we had any Command of God (as they had) for any fuch Service? Why fhould we not have *Trumpets*, and blow with them, as they did too? Yea, and have *Altars*, and *Cenfens*, and *Incense*, and *Thank-Offerings*: as they had? Who is fo blind, as not to fee through thefe *Paper-Arguments*?

The Gift of  
confeived  
Prayer is a gift  
of God, *Ergo*,  
&c.

X. Thirdly, The *Bifhop* tels us, *Mufick* is a gift of God, and it is fit, God (in his Service) and Church fhould have the ufe of fo *Orient a Pearl*. That *Mufick* is the gift of God, none can deny; nor yet, that God ought to be ferved with all his Gifts; But is there no way to ferve God with the ufe of this his gift, but to ufe it in his *worship*? Are there not too, other things that are the gifts of God, of which yet there is no ufe in the *worship* of God! The *Bifhop* will fay (it may be) if we may ferve God with it, why not ufe it in his *Worship*? We answer, becaufe God hath not commanded it. And it is to fet up our *pofts* by Gods *pofts*, and our *Thresholds* by his *thresholds*. This is enough, but much more might be faid, and fhall be faid by and by.

XI. *Ab!* But he tels us, Fourthly, *It is an exercife that fits the duty of Praise and fixeth mens Spirits in it*: We think, it fitteth fome, far better than others, and the *carnal* part of any, better than their *spirituall* part. But we think we fhall never have done, if we ftand difputing (after our Saviours perfect Rule giving in the *Gofpel* what is fitting for his houfe.) Our Saviour knew, that *Mufick* was a gift of God, and fit to exhilarate perfons. And furely when one is dead, his or her relations had need of fomething to chear their fpirit: Yet we find, our Saviour gives no great countenance to the *Muficians*, nor doth any Miracle till they be gone; nor do we find him in the leaft appointing or countenancing *Mufick* in any act of *Worship*: How well it fitteth mens Spirits, we fhall hear fomething by and by, from the obfervation of others.

XII. But he tels us, that the ufe of *Mufick* in Gods *worship*, is as lawfull as finging by *Meeter* and *Tuner*, as any *Psalmody*, or *Hymnology*: We fhall believe this at leifure, becaufe we read of Chriffs finging an *Hymn*, and of the *Apoftles* directions and Command,  
Eph.



Eph. 5. 19. by which we are obliged to sing *Psalmes, Hymns, and Spirituall Songs, making Melody in our hearts to the Lords*. But never of any Command or Direction for *Musickall instruments*. We are mistaken if those words, *Psalmes, Hymns, Songs* do not imply words cast into a metrical order. *Tunes* are necessary, as *circumstances*, without which, nature it self would reach us, that the performance is *indifferent, and disorderly*, and apparently so to all that should hear.

XII. But it will not be amiss to take a view of the *Judgement of Divines in all times*, concerning the use of *Musick in Churches*; by which it will appear, what devout, holy and good men have judged of it, or have by experience found true concerning the use of it.

XIV. We shewed before, that *Justin Martyr*, and the Church in his time, judged it a *puerile Service*, and upon that account, allowed it not in the Church nor can any reasonably expect, that any of the *Ancients* should explicitly declare themselves, against the use of *Musick in Churches*, when it is apparent, that for 900 years after Christ there was no such practice, yet much may be found in them; from which we may judge what (had it then been come into Churches) would have been their sense of it.

XVI. *Lactantius* falls very foully upon the heathen, for believing, *That their Gods did love what they affected*, and for coming to the worship of God to look upon the Gold of the Temple, the fine Marble and Ivory, the brave Stones, and fine Habits, and for believing that their Temples had so much the more Majesty, by how much they were more gay, and adorned. So that (saith he) *Religion is nothing else but Cupiditas humana*, [mens lust.] men think that must needs please God, which pleaseth them. Institu. l. 2. cap. 7.

XVI. It is true, *Singing* was early in the *Eastern Church*, as we learn by the account of the *Christians* behaviour, which *Pliny* gives to *Trajan*. But the *Western Church* received singing very late. *Ambrose* is said first to have used it at *Millain*, when with his Congregation he kept the Church against the *Arrians*; that the night-watchings might be less tedious.

XVII. Let us hear *St. Augustin* speaking, from whence it will not be hard to judge what the reverend person's opinion was about the singing then used, and its fittedness to the duty of *Christians* in praising God; it is in his 10th. book of *Confessions* cap. 33. we will translate it for the Reader. "The pleasures of the ear entangled, & captivated me, but thou (O Lord) hast loosed and delivered me: now I confesse, I do acquiesce in those sounds, which thy Oracles enliven, when they are sung with a sweet artificial voice. Not so as that I stick here,

but

‘but so as I may rise, when I will. But when they come unto  
 ‘me in the very phrases, wherein they live, they seek in my heart a  
 ‘place of dignity, and I can scarce afford them one fitting for  
 ‘them. For sometimes I seem to my self to give more honour to  
 ‘them (*i.e. so sang*) then I ought to do, while I discern my heart  
 ‘to be more kindled into a flame of piety, when those words are  
 ‘sang, then if they were not sang. --- &c. But the delight of my  
 ‘flesh, to which I ought not to give up my mind to be enervated,  
 ‘doth often cheat me, while it doth not so accompany my reason,  
 ‘that it will be patient to come behind it, but because it is ad-  
 ‘mitted for that it enleavours to run before it, and to lead thar.  
 ‘Thus in these things, I sin, not perceiving it, but after-  
 ‘wards I do perceive it. Sometimes more immoderately taking  
 ‘heed of this cheat; I erre, but (very seldom) with too much seve-  
 ‘rity on the other hand, I would have all the melody of those sweet  
 ‘songs with which *David’s Psalter* is fill, remove I from mine and  
 ‘the Churches ears, and what I remember, I have of ten heard told  
 ‘me of *Arbanaſius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who commanded him  
 ‘( in his Church ) that sang the Psalm, so to sing; that he should  
 ‘rather appear to read then sing, seems safe to me. But when I  
 ‘again remember the tears I poured out; at my conversion, at the  
 ‘*Singing of the Church*, and how I am still affected, not with the  
 ‘singing, but with the things that are sang, with a clear distinct  
 ‘voice, and a convenient tuning: I acknowledge the great pro-  
 ‘fit of this Institution, *i.e. Singing*. I am thus divided betwixt the  
 ‘danger of pleasure, and my experiment of *wholesomeness*, and ra-  
 ‘ther incline, yet not pronouncing an irrevocable sentence, to the  
 ‘approbation of the practise of singing in the Church, that *weaker*  
 ‘*Souls* may by the delight of the ears, be raised up in pious affecti-  
 ‘on. Yet when it so falleth out that the *Singing* doth more affect  
 ‘me then the matter sang; I do confesse that I dangerously sin, and  
 ‘had rather not hear those that sing.

XVIII. See how jealous this good man was of his own, and o-  
 thers hearts, lest the melody of an innocent tone should intrice  
 his heart too much from considering the spiritual matter sang;  
 what would he have thought if *Church-musick* had been then in  
 date, where he should have heard nothing, but a carnal sensual de-  
 lightning noise?

XIX. In the next place let us hear St. *Hierome*, (or whoever he was  
 that wrote those Commentaries upon the Epistles of St. *Paul* bound  
 up with S. *Hierome*, *Bellarmin* and *Catharinus*, think *Pelagius* was  
 the

the author *Sixtus Senensis* & *Vilfortius* think it was at least a *Palagan* whoever he was, we may learn the sense of the Church about that time. In those Commentaries on *Ephes. 5. 19.* Let those you, he and such as sing in the Church, saith he, hear this, That we must D. Hieron. in Ep. not sing unto God with the voice, but with the hearts; nor must the jaws and throats of men be pleased with a sweet noise after the fashion of Tragedians the attical tunes, and song must not be sang in the Church, but we must sing there in timore, in opere, in scientia Scripturarum, &c.--- Let the servant of Christ so sing that the words which are read, may please not the Singers tone. That the evil spirit which was in Saul, may in like manner now be cast out of them possessed with it, not brought into them, who make a stage of the house of God. What would this author have said had he lived in our age, and known our Cathedrals?

XX. Bernard confesseth it as his sin, that he often broke his voice *Bernard m.d.* to sing more loud, and was more delighted with the tune he sang, than regarded any cordial compunction. *cap. 11.*

XXI. Pope Gregory saw the abuses of singing crept in early, and Greg. dec. dist. anathematized Deacons that should leave their office in preaching or distributing alms, to turn singing men. *92.*

XXII. *Dancus* saith, Our singing is a meer corruption of an Ordinance of God, and hath in it nothing of piety, nor serves for any thing but to tickle the ears. Peter Martyr saith, he cannot see how it can be tolerated. *Dancus 1 sag. p. 4. l. 4. c. 26. P. Mart. in 1 Cor.* *Tilenus* sharply dammeth it. *Aquinas* (though a Papist) saith, *Tilen. Synag.* the Jews Music was figurative and carnal, and that Music serves only for sensual delight. *Ag. Sem. 2. 3. a. 9. 91. artic. ad 3. Tilenus* saith of it, that we will not English. *Illic ariditas qui magis a meretrici supparasitari potius quam Christiana simplicitate studere maluit. Paris* condemns it in his Commentary, on *1 Cor. 14. 7.* And so indeed do the generality of Protestant Divines. But lest they should be thought too much parties; we will conclude with one who was no Puritan, for we think he lived, and died a Papist, though not resolved to approve all he saw, and heard in the *Romish Synagogue*, without any further account; we will take pains to translate what he saith on, *1 Cor. 14.* *P. I. dist. 49. th. 47. 48, 49.*

XXIII. Upon the *1 Cor. 14. 7.* *I had rather speak five words,* &c. he thus notes.

"In this business 'tis admirable how the custom of the Church is altered; St. Paul had rather speak five words to be understood, than ten thousand in spirit; not to be understood. But now in some Countries they sing all day in spirit (i.e. so as none under-

'stands them) there's neither measure nor end of singing, when as  
 'scarcely in six months a good Sermon is heard, perswading to true  
 'piety (that *St. Paul* calls speaking in understanding) to say nothing,  
 'that in the mean time a kind of Musick is brought in too, to the  
 'worship of God, that none can clearly understand any voice. Nor  
 'have they that sing any leisure to attend what they sing. Only a  
 'noise of voices strikes their ears, and pleaseth them with a mo-  
 'mentary delight. And this might be born, but that the routs of  
 'Priests and Monks place all piety in this, wonderfully differing from  
 'St. Paul; why doth the Church doubt to follow so great an Author?  
 'yea, how dare it dissent from him? what else is heard in Colledges,  
 'Monasteries, Churches, but a roaring of voices? But in *Paul's* time  
 'there was no singing but pronounciation meerly. Singing afterwards  
 'was entertained, but such as was nothing else but a tunable and  
 'distinct pronouncing of the words. Such as we use in rehearsing  
 'the Lords prayer, and the common people too, understood the  
 'language used: now what doth the common people understand but  
 'noises signifying nothing? only a sound strikes their ears? And  
 'these things being first received under a species or shew of piety,  
 'by degrees came to that, that there was neither end nor measure  
 'of *Psalms, Songs, Anthems, Dirges, &c.* that we might see they  
 'made proficiency. And which is yet more grievous, Priests are  
 'more strictly tied to these things then to the commands of Christ.  
 'To hear this the people must be constrained to leave their labor,  
 'with which they must maintain their wives and children (what can  
 'be more sacred?) Let Churches have their solemn singings, but mo-  
 'derate. But we that are imployed in private affairs, must be also  
 'compelled to these things, and carry about a quire with us in *Ships,*  
 '*Coaches, &c.* And from the observation of these, or the neglect of  
 'them, we are judged godly or ungodly. Let a man be a greater  
 'worldling then *Crassus*, a greater reviler then *Zoilus*, yet is he ac-  
 'counted a devout man, because he sings service well, although he  
 'understands nothing of it. I beseech you what do these men  
 'think of Christ, who think he is pleased with such roarings of  
 'voice? Nor are they content with this, but we have also brought  
 'into Churches, a laborious and theatrical musick, a tumultuous  
 'prating of divers voices, such a one as I think was never heard up-  
 'on any stage amongst the *Gracians* or *Romans*. All places roar  
 'with Trumpets, Pipes, Cornets, Dulcimers, and with these mens  
 'voices are mixed; *Love Songs*, and other filthy songs, (to which  
 'Whores and Mimicks dance) are heard. People run to Church

as to a Stage to tickle their ears, and for this use are bred *Organists*, and maintained at great charge: children's age is spent in learning such prattling, while in the mean time they learn nothing that good is. A rabble of sordid and light persons is bred, and the Church is loaded with the maintenance of them, and that too for a pestilent employment. I beseech you do but count how many poor people ready to famish, might be maintained with the salaries of these Singing men? These things do so please them, that among the *Brittains* (especially) the Monks do nothing else. Those whose singing should be mourning, think God is appeased with their lascivious neighings and moveable throats. For this purpose also, boyes and striplings, and Artists in singing are bred up amongst the *Brittains*, for the nonce (soo-sooth) to sing a *fine-tuned song*, and so play a lesson on the *Organs* to the Holy Virgin-Mother. And the Bishops are constrained at their houses to breed up and maintain such Choristers. And [the Monks] wholly taken up with these things, never understand any learning, nor any thing in which true Religion consisteth. Now those that have thick-pates, and cannot learn Musick, think they do not do their duty on a holy day, if they do not use a scurvy kind of singing, which they call *Fauburdum*, that neither recites any thing prescribed, nor keeps any harmony of Art. Add to this, that whereas sober Musick was brought into the Church, that the thing sang might more affect the hearers mind, they think it a brave thing, if one or other of them, can roar, or bellow so loud, that none can hear a word. In this they indulge fools affections, and provide for their bellies. Why should these things only please us? which *Paul* would have sparingly used (according to the fancy of little ones) yea which *St. Paul* would never have endured? he speaks of sacred reading, not of Stage-play-singing. Let us sing in the spirit, but let us sing Christian-like, let us sing sparingly, rather let us sing with the heart; let us speak with tongues, but seldom, let us prophecy more studiously. Let rather be heard the voice of the Preacher, improving the conscience, comforting the dejected, quickning drouie souls, opening the sacred Spirits Mysteries, and let tender age be rather spent in these things.

Thus far that learned man, though a professed *Papist*, concerning the usefulness of our Cathedral Musick and Singing, after he had had a large experiment of it.

XXIV. To shut up this Discourse, We say, That Musick was a rarest gift of God, that God under the old dispensation of the



New-Covenant, appointed it to be used in his worship, as *preservative* (saith *Aquinas*, *Willet*, *Zipperus*) of our making *Melody* in our hearts to the Lord under the Gospel, or of that sweet peace of Conscience which flows to the soul, upon the exercise of faith in Christ. Or rather, as one of those *Carnal Ordinances*, which the Apostle saith the first Temple had, Heb. 9. as they also had *terrene and earthly Promises* (as *Aquinas* saith.) In the time of Reformation by Christ, neither he nor his Apostles used or appointed any; nor did the *Primitive Church*: *Justin Martyr* in his time accounted it *Judaizing*, so did *Aquinas*, within these 500 years; so that it is a perfect *Innovation*, without any pretence of *Institution*, or any ancient Tradition, grossly abused to Wantonness and Superstition. The *Magdeburghenses* tell us, *Ambrose* was against all *Musick* any where, *pudicitia gratia*, because he saw it served for lust, for the most part. To maintain the use of it, the Church-revenues were consumed, in nourishing singing Boyes and singing men, *Choristers*, *Masters of Musick*, *Organists*, and many of these were, and are prophane beastly persons, and no profit at all arose from it; but the peoples understanding confounded, with insignificant noises, and their ears only tickled with air. People came to Church, saith *Erasmus*, as to a Stage-play, and went away (ordinarily) saith *Hospius*, as soon as the Musick (for which alone they came) was over. Infinite Sums of money were spent about Organs. *Zonaras* tells us, that *Michael* Emperor of *Constantinople*, made Organs of gold; and *Brusehius* in his Discourses of the Monasteries of *Germany*, tells us of an *Abbot* that made a pair of Organs, whose greatest pipe was 28 Foot long, and four spans about. Upon all these considerations, and after all this experience, and the joyned suffrage of all *Protestants*, and many sober *Papists* in condemning this course, what shall we say, to hear a Protestant Bishop pleading for them, and fastning such a charge as he doth, upon all those that would have them removed out of the Church? We can say nothing, but *The Lord say it not to his charge.*

XXV. *Andreas Chraftowius*, Polonian, (who is cited by *Didaclevius* in *Alt. Damasc.* c. 8.) thus determines in this case; 'It ordinarily comes to pass, that peoples ears (once accustomed to this Musick) disdain to hear the Word of God, and those things which the Church ought to have repeated with the mouth for a testimony of her faith, and for Edification, are committed to dumb and irrational Organ-pipes. With the mouth, not with Trumpets, &c. as Confession made to salvation. Whence it is that  
'Divines

*Cyastorius*  
*Polonius*, in  
*præf. de cerem.*  
& *car. Missæ*  
*thes.* 41. 42.

'Divines teach, that these things hinder, not profit Priests according to the order of *Malchisedeck*. That they are more fit for the *Aronical Altar*, the time it self sheweth, wherein they first began to be used in Sacred Offices: For *Bellarmino* himself confesseth that they first began to be used in the time of *Pope Vitalian*, but he brings no reason why none of them were used either in the Apostles, or in *Constantines* time: for if they began to be used after the year 660. or 820. we must believe, that humane nature had a great wrong, in that for so many years it did not apply this faculty to the praise of God. For we believe the Apostles loved Christ with all their hearts. The former and more religious ages had weak ones too, though no Organs were used to help them. I know not whether they increase or diminish tediousness: For men seldom see those Musical-masters godly, and those Instruments with their length, are troublesome to such as sing with the voice. Let the matter be as it will, I affirm, that *Bellarmino* with his distinction of *Ceremonies*, could not answer *P. Martyrs* reason against these. For as the offering of bloody sacrifices, though common both to the *Jews* and *Heathens*, was taken away by Christs blood on the Cross, as unsutable to the Priest-hood after the order of *Malchisedeck*; so though the *Heathens* used these Instruments in the Solemnities of their Idols (as *Nebuchadnezzar* in the Dedication of his Image) yet these were convenient for the Jewish Ceremonial worship, &c.

XXVI. But the truth is, all that can be pretended for Church-Musick, is the Authority of the Church, to add what Ceremonies she pleaseth to the worship of God, which we must speak something to in the next Chapter: Though neither can Church-Musick come under that Notion, for it is a perfect service of it self, not always appendant to singing, and is so used, a perfect Poet set up by Gods Poets: an Ordinance of mans added to the Ordinances of God for his Worship, which our souls shall desire to take heed of.

## CHAP. XVI.

*The Bishops Reasons for the English Ceremonies, considered. The Churches Power about Ceremonies, examined. No Principle to be maintained to death. Archbishop Parkers Opinion of humane Ceremonies. Reasons against them.*

I. **V**E are come to the last thing which we shall take notice of in the Bishops Book: and that is his zealous Assertion of the Churches power in appointing Ceremonies and Circumstances of divine Worship. This is indeed the root of all, the Pandora's Box, the very fountain of all those Impositions, which have bred so much trouble, disturbance and persecutions in the Church of God. Let us first see how the Bishop asserts it.

II. He tells us, That the last shock of popular envy which the innocent and excellent Liturgy of England was wont to bear, was from the Ceremonies. For which the sum of his plea, is this.

1. That they are few.
2. Retained as signal marks of Faith, or Humility; or Purity, or Courage, or Constancy.
3. Not as Sacramental signs conferring Grace, but merely as visible Tokens, apt by a sensible sign to affect the understanding with something worthy of its thoughts, as signified thereby.
4. St. Augustine was no enemy to them.
5. They are established by the Laws of Church and State.
6. They fall not under Second, but the Third, Fourth and Fifth Command.
7. They are like Cloaths, fitted to our Bodies, and Periwicks to our Head; and Tunes to our Psalms.
8. They do not burden any conscience.
9. It is most true, and undeniably to be maintained even unto the death. That this National Church, as all others, hath from the Word of God Liberty. Power and Authority, within its own Policy and Bounds, to judge of what seemeth to it most orderly and decent, as to any ceremony or circumstance in the Worship of God, which the Lord hath left unconfin'd, free and indifferent in its own nature, and only to be confin'd or regulated, by every such Ecclesiastical polity within it self &c.

III. We must in our examination of this Harangue, crave leave to alter his Lordships method, and to begin with the last thing first; for if the Lord hath left to the Church or State, no such power at large, or if it be bounded by some general rules to be observed in the exercise, which are not observed in some particular impositions.

ons, all the former pleas, that they are *few, signal mark, &c.* not *Sacramental sign, &c.* come to just nothing. Yet we cannot but observe, how the Bishop hath provided a way to light upon his legs (say what we will.) For it cannot be denied but the Church hath a full power from the word of God, within its own polity and bounds, to judge of what seems to it most orderly and decent, as to any circumstance in the worship of God, which the Lord hath left unconfin'd, free and indifferent in its own nature. And only to be confin'd or regulated by every such Ecclesiastical Polity within it self, i.e. The Lord hath left that to be regulated by the Church, which he hath left to be regulated by the Church. A most momentous and undoubted truth! never denied by any. But that is not the question: This is the question; *Whether it be the will of God, that the Church should regulate and determine, all things which the Word of God hath left indifferent as to the worship; or, whether God by leaving them indifferent, hath not declared his will that the Church so leave them too.*

IV. Yet were the first part determin'd affirmatively, it would not reach the mark, for it would then be queried, *Whether the particular ceremonies appointed for us, be such, considering the letter of the Scripture, or the circumstances of those ceremonies, with the reason and consequences of Scripture Texts that they (under those circumstances considered) can be lookt upon as indifferent yea or no.*

V. The Bishop is yet confounding us with the complicated notion of the Authority of the Church and State. In England there are no ceremonies established by any other authority then that of the State, which having called together some Ecclesiastical persons, heard their advice, & by a Law established some rites and ceremonies, to which no soul is otherwise obliged, then to a State-constitution.

VI. That the Word of God hath left many things (not possible to be determin'd by it) to the authority of the christian Magistrate, cannot be denied; whether any ceremonies or no, is a question; divers circumstances relating to the worship of God, are undoubtedly so left. These are such as relate to order and decency, i.e. without which the worship of God cannot be orderly and decently performed; and so chiefly relate to time and place, the ordinary adjuncts of humane actions. Thus we freely grant that the civil Power, or the Church (orderly assembled) may determine, at what hours on the Lords day the Congregation shall meet, as also it shall determine particular times for fasting or thanksgiving, as Gods providence shall administer occasions; that places of publick wor-

ship

ship shall be erected, frequented, kept decent, and an hundred things of that nature, which even reason and nature it self teacheth all sober persons to be such, as that without some order to be observed in them, the worship of God either would not be performed, or would be undecently performed.

VII. But that either any Church or *civil Authority*, shall be absolute judges of order and decency, and that whatsoever of this nature shall be commanded by them, shall therefore be judged decent and orderly, because they say so? and their commands shall oblige mens consciences in things of this nature, where the word of God is silent, will want some proof before it be credited.

VIII. Or, that they have power, to command and impose such things, under the notion of order and decency, which have been grossly abused to idolatry and superstition, or at which pious people have for a long time declared themselves scandalized, or which have remarkable appearance of evil in them; is so grossly false, that it needs no confutation, for they themselves are commanded, *To abstain from all appearance of evil*, to give no offence either to Jew or Gentile.

IX. Nor is it true, that they have any authority to appoint significative ceremonies, where are sensible signs, to affect the understanding. This is to give them Authority to institute Sacraments, God hath appointed us ordinances, whereby sensible signs, spiritual mysteries are represented to us. These are his Sacraments, we know no authority men have to add to them, though they avoid the Popish rock of their conferring grace, which we say no true Sacrament doth *ex opere operato*.

X. Now for any such ceremonies as these, we crave leave to dissent from the Bishop, let them never be so few, imposed under what specious pretence they will, let who will be for them, and let them be established how they will, we believe them reducible to no command, but certainly and justly burthensome to any tender conscience. No ways like cloths fitted to our bodies, (because not any way necessary) nor like tunes for Psalms, because the worship of God might be decently enough performed without them. They may for ought we know be as good as perukes [or periwigs] to make a specious shew of devotion for them, the baldness of whose hearts stands in need of such things to dissemble them to the world.

XI. If the Bishop think that the Churches power to establish such ceremonies, be a principle to death to be asserted. We dare say he is the first Confessor that Doctrine ever had, and (which God forbid) should he ever seal such a cause with his blood, we should think he deserved no better Epitaph, then, *Hic jacet Praemartyr Gregorius, cui parum Ecclesia Christiana nunquam prius habuit, nec posthac unquam*



*habeat.* Was there ever heard of any yet that died in the defence of a Churches right to institute in the Church what it pleased; so as it was such as Gods word did not forbid? Tell it not in Gath, O publish it not in the tents of Askelon.

XII. Let us hear Arch-Bishop Parkers opinion in this case, he lived in darker times, then ours are, but yet it seems had more Gospel light, or a more Gospel spirit; he was consecrated 1559.

Having told us of Aug. the Monk's eagerness (even beyond his Mr. Pope Gregories directions) to bring in the Romish Liturgy and new Ceremonies in Eng. which yet he could not do, (without the blood of 1200 Monks that opposed him.) He thus bewails that first Prelats fury.

And truly (saith he) that contention then stirred up by *Augustin*, about bringing in the Popish Ceremonies or Rites, which could not then be appeased, without the blood and slaughter of many innocent Britains, hath reached unto our times, with the like destruction and slaughter of Christians. For when men by those pompous Ceremonies departed from the pure simplicity of the primitive Church, they took no great care for holiness of life, for the preaching of the Gospel, for the comforts of the holy Spirit, but they raised new contentions every day, about new Ceremonies added by several Popes, who thought none worthy of any great place, who did not bring in some new Ceremonies, (that I may not say) monstrous, unheard of, and unusual thing, so they filled both Schools, and Pulpits with tales, and brablings: The primitive Church was more simple, and white, with the intire and inward worship of God, prescribed in his word; she was not splendid with garments, nor adorned with magnificent buildings, nor shining with gold, silver, and precious stones. — But the Romish Church, even in that great St. *Augustines* time, was so evergrown with Ceremonies, that he complained, that the condition of Christians, in respect of the multitude of Rites and Ceremonies, was worse then that of the Jews, who though they acknowledged not their time of liberty, yet were subjected only to Rites appointed by Gods Law, not to humane presumptions, for they used fewer Ceremonies, then the Christians in Gods worship. But had he perceived what heapes were after added by several Popes, I believe that he, who then saw the evil of them in the Church, would have set some Christian bound to them. For we see that the Church is not yet free from that contention about Ceremonies; but men, otherwise, learned, and pious, contend and quarrel about Vestments and such trifles, in a more brawling, and military, then

*Antiq. Eccles.  
Britan. cap. 17.*

Phi.

Philosophical, or Christian manner. But This worthy person would hardly have died in defence of a power to appoint Ceremonies.

XIII. But suppose it were not *per se*, unlawful for the State, or Church, to appoint some mystical and significant Ceremonies: yet may all such things be done without any regard at all to circumstances? St. Paul saith; *All things are lawfull for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are Lawfull, but all things edifie not.* And we have heard such a maxime, as *Quicquid non expedit, in quantum non expedit, non licet.* Every thing that is not expedient, so far as 'tis inexpedient, is unlawful. St. Paul determined the eating of flesh, and many other things inexpedient, by reason of the offence, and therefore those things would have given, supposing any Ceremonies to have been used by idolaters; and that the former use of them hath proved a continuall scandal to many good Christians, and bred a continuall division in the Church, and if restored, that the scandal will be ten times greater then ever, and the sufferings of innocent souls for non-conformity to them, an hundred times more then ever: are they yet lawfull? or desirable? or is it worth the dying to maintain the Churches power as to the establishing such Ceremonies? the Father of old we know thought the best way to convert the heathens, was to have nothing to do with their Rites, &c. And is not this the likeliest way to convince the Romish idolaters? at least to keep our souls clear of their guilt?

*Quæritis quomodo vincatur Pagani? deservite eorum ritus, &c.*

See more of this point about Ceremonies in *Altare Damasce-num*. A dispute about the English Popish Ceremonies. Dr. Ames his fresh suit against Ceremonies, in all which this point about Ceremonies is excellently handled

XIV. The number of Ceremonies retained in our Church, pretending to any legal authority, is but small: The Surplice, the Cross, and kneeling at Sacrament, are (we think) all; but we know how grossly all these are abused by the Papists, that none of them have any footing in Scripture; that kneeling at Sacrament was never heard of in the Church till 1226 in Pope Honorius his time admirably fitted to their idolatry of Transubstantiation. That they grossly make the Cross an Idol. That the Surplice is made significant of many things, for which we can see no ground at all; that all these have been strenuously opposed, by as holy and learned men as any our Church hath bred: That the pattern of all Synods A.D. 15. thought fit to impose only to some few necessary things for the State of the Church at that time. That the urging of these Ceremonies, hath been the cause of sad separations, the loss of divers learned and holy mens ministry: The offence of the generality of pious people. That the employment of the Ecclesiastical Courts, was almost wholly taken up about Ministers and peoples not conforming to these, instead of admonishing, suspending, excommunicating, scandalous and debauched Ministers and people, &c.

XV. We know further, that though there be no more *Ceremonies established by Law as yet*, yet there are many probationers, such as *bowing at the Name of Jesus, bowing to the Altar, saying second Service*, (much like the Popish in *Secretors*, which the people must not hear) and what not almost? And we can see no reason, but the *Churches power*; if allowed to appoint any (save only such with out which the Service of God, would apparently to all rational men, be performed indecently and disorderly) may appoint hundreds.

XVI. Nor is it prudence (could such a power be allowed to State, or Church) for either of them in such cases, to do all that they may in strictness be proved to have a power to do. Many men think that the State hath power in any civil thing by Laws, to oblige the consciences of Subjects to do any things not forbidden in Gods Word: and doubtlesse the States power, in such kind of Laws, is far less disputable, then in the case of *Ceremonies* relating to the worship of God. Yet the wisdom of all States, restrains them from enjoyning people by their Laws, to do such kind of things, for the doing of which rational persons may not see a just reason of the Law, as either urging some Law of God, or tending to a manifest, publick, or private good. No State yet ever busied themselves, or tyed their Subjects by making Laws, to command all their Subjects to wear *Turbants*, or a thousand such things, which would apparently signifie nothing of profit or advantage to the State, nor yet to particular persons, it were the way to bring their authority into contempt.

XVII. We would fain know, of what use, or profit, any of these *Ceremonies* are, we look upon them as things that perish with the using, and upon that account by no means reasonable (if otherwise lawful) for the grave Authority of a Church, or State, to interpose in. And we hope God will thus far convince the Authority under which we are, that they will not for the husks of *Ceremonies*, destroy those many thousands souls in *England* (who cannot conform to them) for whom yet Christ dyed. And we are most humbly thankful to His most Excellent Majesty, for the indulgence, as to them, which he hath granted to us, through which, we can yet speak to our people that they may be saved: how long we shall enjoy this breathing times the only al-knowing God can tell. We are sensible enough how much others envy it we shall onely say (as *Calvin* once of *Luther*) we wish they would use their heat against the known enemies of God (such as are drunkards, blasphemers, unclean persons, cursers, swearers, &c.) rather then against the servants of the living God, who shall one day judge betwixt them and us; and who (as it is very probable) would more approve that zeal, then this fury.

N

A



## A Postscript.

Containing a Threefold Supplement to the former discourses. The first, relating to the Chapter about the Antiquity of Liturgies. The Second, to the Argument about Idolatrous Usages. The Third, to the Argument concerning scandalizing of Brethren.

I. **T**Here is nothing in which those we have to deal with in these Points of Liturgies, Ceremonies, Musick in Churches, &c. will pretend more advantage against us than in the business of Antiquity, nothing so much in their mouths, as all Antiquity, all the Fathers, the Church of God in all ages, hath been of their minds. Our Brethren know, or may know, that the Writings of the Ancients, for 8 or 900 years, viz. from Pope Gregories time, till the reformation, were in hands, by no means to be trusted, and that the Papists, who (for the most part of the time) had them in their keeping, as they had opportunity, so they neglected not their time, to correct the Fathers, to put in, and leave out what they pleased, to suppress what of their Writings they pleased, and to publish Canons of Councils, and Commentaries, and other Writings under specious Names, without any shadow of truth, or any reasonable Modesty: So that it hath been a great piece of the work of our Reformed Divines, to look over the books with which the Popish Writers in that time had filled the world, and prepared in M. S. for it (which M. Scripts they have since published in part, and what part yet remains who knows.) He is but meanly versed in Divinity that knows not, that Bellarmine, Sixus Senensis, Posssevinus and Erasmus, (four Popish writers) have took some pains of this nature, and how many hundred pieces of pretended Antiquity, not only Protestant Writers, but even the Papists themselves have been forced to disclaim and reject. And how many more our learned Coccius, Rivet, Perkins, and others have shewed them as much reason to reject. Yet we cannot but observe how some late writers (as if nothing had been said to disprove those spurious writings, have (with confidence enough) urged those writings so rejected, as pure and unsported Authority: witnesse Dr. Hamonds writings, and Dr.

Sparrow in his *Rationale*) and indeed all those who have traded in the business of *Liturgies* and *Ceremonies*, and for the Extravagances of Episcopal Government, &c. we must confess, we have (upon this account) no great value, for any *Arguments* they bring us merely from antiquity, as to matters that concern the worship of God, because we think the word of God is a perfect and sufficient rule in the case, and we want *Vouches* to prove those pretended pieces of *Antiquity*, which they produce to have been theirs, whose names they bear; therefore we cry to the *Law* and to the *Testimony*, we know that the *Copies of the Bible*, have (as hath been by many demonstrated) been by the wonderfull providence of God (dispersing them into so many hands) so preserved, that we dare trust them, and believe that the *Scriptures* which we have, are indeed the Writings of holy men inspired by God; but whose the *Liturgies* are, (called *S. Peters*, *S. James*, *S. Basils*, *S. Chrysostomes*, &c.) we cannot tell, besides that, (as we said before) there's enough in them, to shew they were none of theirs, who are made to father Appales &c. 1. ad them, even the Papists themselves being in a great measure Judges. an. 63.

V. Genes. Annot. in Liturg. Petri Hosti confessione Baronii. Appales &c. 1. ad an. 63.

II. Yet as in matter of *Doctrine* (which our Protestant Divines have well urged) in those abused writings of the Antients which we have, the *Papist Correctors* have (unwarily) left something (and such a something as some of our Protestant Writers have judged enough) to evince many of their *Doctrines Novelties*. So as to the business of *Liturgies* and *Ceremonies*, some things have escaped their nimble eyes. *Jos. Vicecomes* pretends high for *Liturgies*, so doth *Sanctes*, *Pamelius*, *Almarinus*, &c. and much for *ceremonies*; but in *Justin Martyr* and *Tertulian*, there is enough said (which because mentioned by others, we spare to repeat) to prove the Church then was not limited to any forms of Prayer: but there is a remarkable passage in *Socrates* the Ecclesiastical Historian (who lived about the year 430) to prove there were no *Liturgies* in his time.

— Καθὼν μὲν οὖν πανταχὺ καὶ παρὰ πάσαις θρησκείαις ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐκείνη διὰ συμπαντικὰς καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ. We cannot but wonder with what confidence any can tell us *Liturgies* were from the first centuries, when we have so clear a testimony in the fifth Century, that among all Christians in that age hardly two were to be found, that used the same words in prayer. That Chapter of *Socrates* is well worthy the reading over, by which some Divines of our times, may see, that as there was then no such uniformity of *Worship*, and *Ceremonies* as is now contended for; so neither had *Socrates* such a reverend opinion of those that were so zealous to bring in *Ceremonies*; but looked

Socrates Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 21.



# A Discourse of Liturgies;

upon it as a *Jndaining humor* in them, without any justifiable ground from the word of God. The Chapter is too long, and the passages too many to transcribe, the Reader may satisfy himself by perusal of it.

Suppl. 2.

III. Having the advantage of the Supplement, we shall crave leave of our Readers to add some few things, to advantage our argument against the *Common-Prayer Books* (ordinarily obtruded upon us,) from what we have said before; *That we find in them a mode of Worship and Forms, which hath been formerly used in idolatrous services*: upon which account we are much inclined to think it not lawfull for us to use them in the service of God, especially considering what we have said before, (from the Apostle) *The earth is the Lords, and the fulness thereof*. We may easily use other words.

We would hope that many of our brethren, who are zealous for *Liturgies*, do believe that the worship of the Church of Rome is *Idolatrous*, and hath been so ever since the practice of praying to *Saints* and *Angels*; praying before *Images*; the worshipping of *Crosses* and *Relicks*, and the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* came up amongst them. If any be otherwise minded, we have nothing to do with them, but only to commend them to that learned Treatise of Dr. *Reinolds D: Idolatria Ecclesie Romana*; and the many Tracts and pieces; of Tractates wrote by *Protestant Divines* to prove this charge.

Tertul. l. de idol.  
cap. I.

IV. We remember what *Tertullian* saith, *Principale crimen generis humani, summus saculi reatus, tota causa iudicii Idolatria*: Of all sins, none so horrid as that of *Idolatry*: This is sufficiently asserted in Scripture, and proved by *Tertullian* and others. *Tertullian* proves the *Idolater* a *Murderer*, an *Adulterer*, a thief, &c. And certainly if *Christians* be bound to abstain from all appearance of evil, they are much more obliged to take heed of any thing that hath the least appearance of this evil or affinity to it.

Non est auditum  
a seculis, quod  
quis arcam voca-  
ret Deum suum,  
vel ollam, vel  
pixidem: Gul.  
Paris. de leg. c. 26

V. That *Idolatry* is not only committed by worshipping the creature terminatively (which was an *Idolatry* we believe very few were ever guilty of) but also, by the offering up any homage proper &c due unto God only, before any creature, as the medium, or as representative of God, is so eminently proved by the instances of the *Jews* worshipping the golden Calf (who yet proclaimed the feast to *Jehovah*) which the Apostle calls *Idolatry*, *1 Cor. 10*. By *Jeroboams* and *Michals* idolatry, and divers others, that it is not a point now to be disputed, being granted by all sober *Protestants*. But besides these two wayes, there are others also by which we may be guilty of the sin of *Idolatry*, become *Affines idolatrie*, as *Tertullian* speaks accessary, if not principals. The Apostle, *1 Cor. 10*. plainly determines, that to eat of meat offer-

ed

ed to idols (in the idols temple) was to have a fellowship with devils.

VI. Gods Eminent hatred of idolatry, was seen by divers severe prohibitions to his people, forbidding any fellowship with idolaters, or imitation of their actions, or to follow their modes and methods of worship; or to use such names as they used to call their idols by in their speaking to God. 1. For civill usages, Lev. 19. 19. *Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed; neither shall a garment of linnen and wollen come upon thee.* V. 17. *You shall not round the corners of your head, neither shalt thou marre the corners of thy beard,* 28. *you shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you.* To this head may also be referred the law against womens wearing mans apparel; or in man wearing a womans apparel. All these saith Gul. Paris. were to avoid the imitation of Idolaters. The first (saith he) was *jugillatio cultura seu idolatra Veneris & Priapi*. The garment mingled of linnen and woollen was forbidden them (saith he) because the Egyptian Priests did use such: Aquinas, Liranus, Tostatus, Hugo, &c. give the same reason. Herodotus tells us, that the Arabians, were wont to shave their hair, and to cut the corners of their beards, to bring their hair into a round figure (which the Prophet Jeremy confirms, describing them under the notion of such as had the corners of their hair pulled Jer. 9. 26. and again 49. 32. (see the Margent in our English Bibles.) The Syrians, Egyptians, and Arabians, were wont to pull off their hairs to make baldness betwixt their eyes, to make prints and marks in their flesh, in mourning for the dead; God forbids them to his people, Deut. 14. 1. Lev. 19. 28. The Hebr. Doctors give this reason for his command, as may be seen in their, 61. Neg. præc. as also 62. 63. Lucian, Plutarch, Kirchmannus, Arnobius, Eusebius, Cicero, Pliny, with many more, tell us strange stories of the heathens usages of this nature. All which God forbids his people, (as Gul Parisienfis well notes) to root out all the mention of idolatry from amongst them, and to restrain them from any manner of conformity to the manners of idolaters. Upon which account also mutual marriages were expressly forbidden betwixt the Jews and any idolatrous Nations.

2. In a further detestatione of this sin, and for a further caution, \*Note, that both God sayes, \*Hof. 2. 16, 17. *Thou shalt call me no more Baali, thou shalt call me Iſti, for I will take away the names of Baalim out of thy mouth, and they shall no more be remembered by that name.* 16 and in Zech, 13. 2. two texts plainly relating to the times of the Gospel, God forbids all mention of Idolatry, and declares his will that it should not be so much as remembered. Now we cannot see how we should obey those precepts, in keeping their very Rites, Modes and Methods of worship. V. Cald paraph. in 2 Hof. VVhere

Where we note, that God would not allow (especially in his worship) that his people should use a Name to him, (how good and proper soever) which had been used in an idolatrous service. *Tarnovius* and *Rivet* both observe that the name *Baali* was not onely proper enough, (signifying *My Lord*) but also had formerly a sacred use; God himself using it of himself, *Isa.* 54. 5. but it having been afterwards defiled by an *Emphaticall* use; in an *Idolatrous service*; God abhors it, and will no more be called by it. This sense *St. Hierom* of old gave of the Text; and *Ballester* the *Jesuite* in his *Onomatographia* agrees in it. *Lyranus* indeed follows *R. Solomon Jarchi* in another interpretation, making *Baali* *Nomen timoris*, *Ishi* *Nomen amoris*.

But as (amongst the *Heb. Doctors*, *Kimchi* and *Aben Ezra*, interpret it more rightly, viz. That the reason why *Baali* was forbidden, was, because it was the Name of an *Idol*; so the *Caldea Paraphrast* agrees in that sense; and *Ribera* (though a *Jesuit*) is full in it, and concludeth, that *Bahal* and *Ishi* signifie the same thing, *ὁ ἵψωρ* (whence possibly that phrase in *John* 3. *He that hath the Bride, is the Bridegroom*) and that the sense of the Text is this, *Seeing the Word Ishi and Baali signifie the same thing, yet I so hate the Names of Idols, that I will not have that spoken which might be well spoken, in regard of the ambiguity and similitude of the word.* *Ribera* makes *St. Hierom* his Author, with whom also *Cocceius* agrees in these terms,

----*Ne dum aliud loquitur, alterius recorderur.*

Least men speaking to God, should think of Idols. In this sense also agrees *Cyril Alexandrinus*) or whoever he was who is the Author of those Commentaries, which go under his Name, upon the *Small Prophets*, Printed, Gr. Lat. *Ingolstadtii*, 1607.) To this agrees the Learned *Rivet*, *Zanchy*, *Daneus*, *Sanctius*, *Polanus*, in short, almost all creditable Authors. Let us only adde some of *Zanchy* and *Rivets* Notes, upon the Text, nor impertinent to our purpose.

‘God declares here (saith *Zanchy*) that the *Israelites* (having put all superstitions out of their Temples, yea out of their mouths and minds) should be content with one God alone, and with his pure Word. And accordingly he teacheth us, that a true Reformation is not in those places, nor a true Worship or Religion there, where ANY Reliques of false Religion do remain: For all the Footsteps of Superstition must be taken away, not only out of Churches, but out of our mouths and memories, that no door

*Ribera in*  
*2 Hof. 16.*

*Zanchy in*  
*Hof.*

'door may be left open to former Idolatry: For the very remembrance of False Worship hath an influence upon men, to incite them to it again. We must therefore let nothing of the Popish Worship remain, unless we would have it all in again.

The Learned *Rivet* in his *Corollaries from this Scripture*, makes this for one; 'That there are many Names which in themselves are good enough, and might be used, but God abhorreth the use of them, because they have been abused to Idolatry. He instanceth in the word *Mass*, applied to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, to which may be added *Priest* and *Altar* ) Then he inferreth thus.

'Hence we may judge, how prudently some of the *Antients* did to use the names of *Old Superstition*, in opening the *Sacred Services* of Christians: whence arose another superstition, and the purity of *divine worship* was vitiated. And there is reason to fear least the same thing should happen in those Churches in which (though they pretend a Reformation) yet the very words, ceremonies and rites of the Papists are preserved. — That the reformation of Divine worship may please God, and be proved to come from him as the author of it, it must be perfect. Let no reliques of that worship which God rejecteth, remain. Let them therefore who yet keep Images in their Churches, and defend them, and other Reliques of false Religion, consider, whether they can say, that the names of *Baalim* are taken away amongst them: but enough is spoken to prove our second observation.

3. But thirdly, God more expressly forbad his people, any usages in his worship, which were used in idolatrous services. To this purpose was that Precept, *Exod.* 20. 26. and that *v.* 24. in which God forbad the people of Israel to go up by steps unto his altar, or to make an altar of hewen stone. Both (as *Lyrannus*, *Lippomannus*, and many others agree,) That they might not be like Idolaters; Those filthy beasts that worshiped *Priapus*, were wont so to ascend by steps. And the heathens much fancied an *August Pompens* serving of their gods, and therefore made their altars of hewen stone. God would have his Altar of Earth, or rough stones, to let them see he regarded not that pompous splendor, but abominated these things which were borrowed from Idolaters. We do not understand why it is reckoned as the sin of those, *Ezek.* 8. 26. that they worshipped with their faces towards the East, (which was unlawfull to the Israelites) save only that the Heathens so worshipped their idols; (which perhaps was the reason why the Temple stood another way)

way)

Where we note, that God would not allow (especially in his worship) that his people should use a Name to him, (how good and proper soever) which had been used in an idolatrous service. *Tarnovius* and *Rivet* both observe that the name *Baali* was not onely proper enough, (signifying *My Lord*) but also had formerly a sacred use; God himself using it of himself, *Isa.* 54. 5, but it having been afterwards defiled by an *Emphaticall* use in an *Idolatrous service*; God abhors it, and will no more be called by it. This sense *St. Hierom* of old gave of the Text; and *Ballester* the *Jesuite* in his *Onomatographia* agrees in it. *Lyranus* indeed follows *R. Solomon Jarchi* in another interpretation, making *Baali* *Nomen timoris*, *Ishi* *Nomen amoris*.

But as (amongst the *Heb. Doctors*, *Kimchi* and *Aben Ezra*, interpret it more rightly, *viz.* That the reason why *Baali* was forbidden, was, because it was the Name of an Idol; so the *Caldea Paraphrast* agrees in that sense; and *Ribera* (though a *Jesuit*) is full in it, and concludeth, that *Bahal* and *Ishi* signifie the same thing, *ἰσχυρ* (whence possibly that phrase in *John* 3. *He that hath the Bride, is the Bridegroom*) and that the sense of the Text is this, *Seeing the Word Ishi and Baali signifie the same thing, yet I so hate the Names of Idols, that I will not have that spoken which might be well spoken, in regard of the ambiguity and similitude of the word.* *Ribera* makes *St. Hierom* his Author, with whom also *Cocceius* agrees in these terms,

----*Ne dum aliud loquitur, alterius recorderur.*

Least men speaking to God, should think of Idols. In this sense also agrees *Cyril Alexandrinus*) or whoever he was who is the Author of those Commentaries, which go under his Name, upon the *Small Prophets*, Printed, Gr. Lat. *Ingolstadii*, 1607.) To this agrees the Learned *Rivet*, *Zanchy*, *Daneus*, *Sanctius*, *Polanus*, in short, almost all creditable Authors. Let us only adde some of *Zanchies* and *Rivets* Notes, upon the Text, not impertinent to our purpose.

‘God declares here (saith *Zanchy*) that the *Israelites* (having put  
‘all superstitions out of their Temples, yea out of their mouths and  
‘minds) should be content with one God alone, and with his pure  
‘Word. And accordingly he teacheth us, that a true Reformation  
‘is not in those places, nor a true Worship or Religion there, where  
‘*ANY* Reliques of false Religion do remain: For all the  
‘Footsteps of Superstition must be taken away, not only  
‘out of Churches, but out of our mouths and memories, that no  
door

*Ribera in*  
*2 Hof. 16.*

*Zanchians in*  
*Hof.*



'door may be left open to former Idolatry: For the very remembrance of False Worship hath an influence upon men, to incite them to it again. We must therefore let nothing of the Popish Worship remain, unless we would have it all in again.

The Learned *Rivets* in his *Corollaries from this Scripture*, makes this for one; 'That there are many Names which in themselves are good enough, and might be used, but God abhorreth the use of them, because they have been abused to Idolatry. He instanceth in the word *Mass*, applied to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, to which may be added *Priest* and *Altar* ) Then he inferreth thus.

'Hence we may judge, how prudently some of the *Antients* did to use the names of *Old Superstition*, in opening the *Sacred Services* of Christians: whence arose another superstition, and the purity of divine worship was vitiated. And there is reason to fear least the same thing should happen in those Churches in which (though they pretend a reformation) yet the very words, ceremonies and rites of the Papists are preserved. — That the restauration of Divine worship may please God, and be proved to come from him as the author of it, it must be perfect. Let no reliques of that worship which God rejecteth, remain. Let them therefore who yet keep Images in their Churches, and defend them, and other Reliques of false Religion, consider, whether they can say, that the names of *Baalim* are taken away amongst them: but enough is spoken to prove our second observation.

3. But thirdly, God more expressly forbad his people, any usages in his worship, which were used in idolatrous services. To this purpose was that Precept, *Exod.* 20. 26. and that *v.* 24. in which God forbad the people of Israel to go up by steps unto his altar, or to make an altar of hewen stone. Both ( as *Lyrannus*, *Lippomannus*, and many others agree, ) That they might not be like Idolaters; Those filthy beasts that worshiped *Priapus*, were wont so to ascend by steps. And the heathens much fancied an *August Pompens* serving of their gods, and therefore made their altars of hewen stone. God would have his Altar of Earth, or rough stones, to let them see he regarded not that pompous splendor, but abominated these things which were borrowed from Idolaters. We do not understand why it is reckoned as the sin of those, *Ezek.* 8. 16. that they worshipped with their faces towards the East, ( which was unlawfull to the Israelites ) save only that the Heathens so worshipped their idols; ( which perhaps was the reason why the Temple stood another way )

Aqui. 12. c.  
q. 12. ut. 4. ad 5

way) we are sure *Aquinas* assigns this as a reason, why (as he saith) the Jews worshipped *Westward*. The same was the reason against *Groves near Gods Altar*, *Dut. 16. 22*. Such had the Heathens, *Exod. 34. 13*. It was laid to the *Israelites* charge, *2 Chron. 13. 9*. that they made *Priests like the Nations*; and it was *Ahaz* his great sin, *2 Chron. 16. 11*. That he must have his *Altar* like that of *Damascus*. There are that think, that it was a piece of *Azazah's* guilt, (for which God smote him with death,) that he carried the *Ark* upon a new *Cart*, (as the *Idolatrous Philistines* had done before) we are not ignorant that he failed in other points of order too. But we shall shut up this with two remarkable Texts, the one *Levit. 18. 3*. After the doings of the land of *Egypt*, wherein you dwelt, shall you not do, and after the doings of the land of *Canaan*, whither I bring you, you shall not do, neither shall you walk in their ordinances, you shall do my judgements, and keep my ordinances, and walk in them, I am the Lord your God, you shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgements, which if a man do, he shall live in them.

The second Text (yet more remarkable) is that, *Dent. 12. 29. 30*. &c. When the Lord thy God shall cut off the Nations from before thee, whither thou goest to possess them; and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their land, take heed to thy self, that thou be not snared by following them, after that they be destroyed before thee, and that thou enquire not after their gods, saying, How did these Nations serve their gods, . Even so will I do likewise. Thou shalt not do so unto the Lord thy God. — What thing so ever I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it. Upon the first Text the learned *D. Willet* (who surely was no *Fanatique*, no not in the *Irish Dialect*, but though he had not the honour to be a *Father*, may pass for a son of the Church) observes, That by the two Nations *Egypt* and *Canaan*, all other Nations were understood, whose corrupt manners they were to decline, *Jer. 10. 2*. By the latter Text certainly in general; all humane inventions in the worship of God are forbidden, and more particularly, the imitation of *Idolaters* in their mores, and methods of worship. Considering the force of all which Texts, our hair almost stands right up, to read a late *Prelates* book, if it be his, about *Ceremonies*, where with a variety of learning he shewes our *Ceremonies* are borrowed partly from the *idolatrous heathens*, partly from the *Idolatrous Papists*, and yet he justifies the use of them, yea could almost justify the reduction of a great part of the ceremonial Law of the Jews so long since abolished.

Bish. Andrews.

VII. We are the more startled at it to consider the zeal of the *An-*

cients, (whom when our brethren please, or rather when they are pleased by what they find in them, they use so much to adore) in this great and momentous case. *Tertullian* in his admirable Book *de Idolatria*, chargeth very many Symbolizing with Idolaters, it will not be amiss to give the Reader his heads. *Tertull. de Idolatr. lib.*

1. Such as made Statues and Images, (though it were their trade) Cap. 6. he tells these poor trades-men, That they sacrificed their wit, their sweat, their labour, their art, to the Idol. *Illis ingenium tuum immollas illis sudorem tuum libris illis prudentiam tuam accendis, plus es illis quam sacerdos, quum per se habeant sacerdotem.* He brings under this guilt, all kind of Mechanicks imployed about building, or adorning Idol-temples, &c. or making up, or the adorning the Idols.

2 His second sort are *Asirolours*, whom he proves deeply Cap. 9. guilty.

3 His third sort are *School-masters*, he says these are *affines* Cap. 10. *multimoda Idolatria*, a kin to Idolatry, in naming the names of Idols, and making honourable mention of them in their *Orations*, &c. *Polanus* on 2 *Hof.* also toucheth this as not savouring enough of Christianity. *Tertullian* saith; *Hinc prima diabolo fides aliciscatur ab inijs eruditionis.*

4. A fourth sort he instanceth in, are those that keep Holydayes Cap. 14. dedicated to Idolatrous service, where he complains of the Christians in his time that kept *Saturnalia*, *Januaris Brumas*, *Matronales*, the Pagan Holy-dayes, (instead of *Saturnalia*, is our Christmas at the very same time of the year) here he cries out, *O melior fides Nationum in suam s. Etam!* The Heathens (saith he) will not keep our Sabbath-day, nor our Pentecost, but we must keep their Festivals. How much more true to their Religion are they, then we to ours?

In the next place he brings them under the guilt of Symbolizing Cap. 15. with Idolaters, who adorned their gates, and posts, and houses, after the Pagan manner at Festivals, (as we do at Christmas) with *Lawrel*, *Ivy*, &c. One would think this were an innocent usage, yet how vehemently doth that good man inveigh against it? *Accendat igitur quotidie lucernas quibus lux nulla est, adfigant postibus lauros postea arsuras quibus ignes immanent, & testimonia tenebrarum & auspicia poenarum. Tu, lumen es mundi, & arbor viceris semper. Si templum renuncias, si ne facias templum januum tuam. Minus dixi, si lapidibus renuncias, ne indueris faciem domus tua, novi lupanaris.*

We need proceed no further, what would this good man have said to our *Candlemas services*, to our Christmas *Ivyes* and *Bayes*, &c.

A Discourse of Liturgies;

may to an hundred things of higher consequence then these are. Nor do we find this Primitive zeal against appearances of Idolatry, in single persons only, but also in Councils, v. *Concil Antisiod. can. 1. Concil. Tolet. 4 can. 10.* with diverse other *Canons* made against the *Calends of January*, (which with us is turned to *New-years-day*) (*Concil. Tolet.* would not suffer *Alleluia* to be sang that day, because it was a *Pagan Holy-day*. Other *Councils* for the same reason forbade *Green-boughs*, and *Laurels* in adorning houses. *St. Austin* forbade Christians to fast on the *Lords day*, because the *Manichees* did so. *Ep. 86. Gul. Parisiensis* saith, the Church would not allow fasting on *Fridays*, because the *Turks* use it. In short *Aquinas*,  *Suarez*, *Belarmine*, *Parisienfis*, are all zealous for avoiding all usages of idolaters, which were not necessary. *Augustine de verbis domine*, Ser. 6. calls to Christians to leave all the rites, all the solemnities of the Pagans, and thinks this the best way to convert them. And why should such care be used as to Heathens, but because their services were *Idolatrous*, they *Idolaters*? We are at loss to know wherein they were greater *Idolaters* then the *Papists*. *Parisienfis* saith right, none of the learned of them were ever so mad as to worship a piece of wood, yet the *Papists* worship of a piece of bread. The *Rabbies* of the Heathen were doubtless (as we said before) of *Plato's* mind, that God was (they knew not well what) the soul of the world; or of the same mind that *Trismegistus*, one of their great Philosophers was, that there were certain Spirits, which they called Gods, which came and took possession of those Statues, when they had made them; and they onely made their Statues for thrones (as it were) for their Gods, and supposed representations, or some things to put them in mind of God.

VIII. Now considering this we hope (how uncharitably soever the Bishop of *Exeter* judgeth of us in our abstaining from the use of the *Common-Prayer Book* ordinarily sold) God will judge otherwise, and so will the generality of sober Christians. Let his Lordship speak out, *Is the Church of Rome Idolatrous, yea or no? Is her worship so in the whole complex, yea or not?* If he sayes no, he flies in the face of all Protestant writers. If he sayes it is, we proceed further with him. *Is that mode or method of worship prescribed in the books of Common-prayer, ordinarily to be sold, (as far to the far greater part) the same, which was formerly used, & is to this day used (though in another Language) by those Idolaters?* If he sayes no, let any one diligently compare the *Collects*, *Letany*, &c. with the four books before mentioned, and judge whether he speaks truth or no: If he sayes it is, we ask him again,

Is that Service Book necessary to the worship of God, either by a Divine Law, or by any necessity of nature? If he saith that it is, he will need none to confute him: If he saith it is not, only as commanded by the Church, or by the Laws of the Land; we desire to know of him, whether the use of such things as are not necessary, ought to be retained, when they have been once abused to Idolatry? If it were clear to us, that the Laws of the Land did command the use of the Service book (ordinarily sold) under a penalty, we should take our selves bound with patience to suffer the penalty, but (considering the premises) we could never do the thing. But that doth not yet appeare to us, how soon it may, we know not, *The will of the Lord be done.* Onely because our adversaries have such a delight to whisper us into suspicions of disaffection, and disloyalty, and moroseness, perverseness, peevishness, faction; let us from the premises argue with them a little for our selves.

IX. Can you think it lawfull to use modes of worship (abused to Idolatrous services) when God would not allow his ancient people, a civill usage, which was peculiar to the idolatrous nations? was it unlawfull for them, because the Egyptian Priests wore garments mingled of linnen and wollen, to put any such on their backs? And is it lawfull for us to put on Vestments onely to be used in the worship of God which are confessed to have been after the manner both of the *Pagan* of the Romish Idolaters? Might not they suffer their cattle to gender with divers kinds, nor sow their grounds with divers sorts of seed, because the heathen did it? and may we in our worship of God, serve him with divers sorts of Ceremonies, and modes, and methods of worship, some borrowed from Pagans, some Papiists? (as Bishop Andrews confesseth and proves) though some others of a more innocent extract mingled with them? Might not they round their beards, because the Arabians did so (who were Idolatrous) nor make prints and marks in their flesh? because the Heathens did so, And may we, in the worship of God, use those very postures, figures, forms, actions, which Gods word no where requires, nor are practised in any other Church, but in a Synagogue of Idolaters? Would not God suffer his people to call him Baali, (though the name be of an honest and proper signification, and such a name as himselfe sometimes called himself by) when once it was abused to Idolatry, but must the people after that call him Ishi nor Baali? And can we speak unto God in prayer, in the same forms of words, phrases, &c. which Idolaters have profaned, and judge our selves innocent? Might not the Jews go up by steps to Gods Altar, because the Heathen did so? Nor make God an Altar of Stone, but of Earth, because the Idolatrous

See Bishop Andrews on Ceremonies, p. 52.



latrous Heathen, went up by *steps* to the *Altars* of their *Gods*, and made their *Idols* *Pompous Altars*. And may we do those things while they are done by *Idolatrous Papists*? Was it a guilt in *Ahaz*, that he would have an *Altar* like that of *Damascus*; and shall it be no guilt to us, that we must have a *mode of worship*, as near that of an *Idolatrous Synagogue*, as may be? Were the *Jews* commanded not so much as to enquire how the *Idolatrous Heathens* worship their *Gods*: or to say, *we will go and do likewise*. Nay were they strictly forbidden to do it, and as to the worship of God commanded to keep strictly to the command of God, not adding thereto, nor diminishing therefrom; and shall it be our practice to say, *We will go and do just what the Papists do*, come as near to them as we can? such workings as these we find in our hearts.

X. When we hear some telling of us, these were *Ceremonial* and *Judicial Laws* not obliging us *Christians*. Others, *That it is true, we ought not to chuse these things, but being commanded we ought to do & use them*. And others again, *That although the Popish Idolaters, do or did use these forms and rite, yet these things were not Idolatrous, nor were the Papists the first that used them, for they were used by the pure Church (they know not when nor where)* And others, *That we must not reject all words, phrases, rites and actions, which Idolaters have used, spake or done, and would with these things relieve our selves*.

XI. We find our consciences thus *ex tempore* replying, Are then the *Laws of God* restraining conformity with *Idolaters Ceremonial*? what was there in them *typicall* or *carnal*? The *typical services*, and *carnal ordinances* of the *Ceremoniall Law*, are abolished; but do these commands relate to them? There were also divers particular *Judicial Laws* which the wisdom of God thought fit for the *Jewish polity*, which in *particulari* do oblige no other. But doth not the equity of the *Judicial Law* oblige? was not the end of these *Laws* to bear witness against *Idolatry*; and that Gods people by no communion with *Idolaters*, by no *apish imitation* of them, should defile themselves, or provoke him, or grow again in love with them? Doth not God hate *Idolatry* now as much as then? is his jealousy abated? or hath he since parted with his glory to graven Images? What means the Apostle then *1 Cor. 10.* in cautioning the *Corinthians* to flee from *Idolatry*, and to take heed of eating of the *Love-feast* in the *Idols Temple*? Are they not *Gospel-times* which God speaks of *Hos. 2. 16.* when his people should not call him *Baal* but *Yshi*? nor remember the names of *Idols*? and which he speaks of *Zech. 13. 3.*

XII. If we would relieve our selves by the command of *Magistrates interposing*; besides that we can find no such thing, (and pray that we never may) Our consciences tell us, that if after these *Laws Moses* had commanded the *Israelites* to make round their beards, or to wear garments of linnen or wollen, or women to wear mens apparel, &c. His command could not have justified the *Israelites* practice. We freely allow *Magistrates* all just authority, but not to command people to do what the Lord hath forbidden them.

XIII. When we are told, that though *Idolaters* used these *Rites, Modes, &c.* yet these *Rites* and *Forms* were not *Idolatrous*, and that we hear they were used by *Christians*, before there was any *Papish Idolatry* in the world, and that we must not throw away all things, and abominate all *Actions, Rites, Ceremonies*, which *Idolaters* have abused. Our consciences presently tells us, That there was no *Idolatry* in the cutting of a beard, nor in sowing ground with mingled seed, nor in an Altar of hewn stone, nor in linsay-wolsey; nor in the name *Baali*, nor in the *Corinthians* meat.

2. That though some have talked that these *Rites* and *Modes* were used before any *Papery* was in the world, yet none have proved it; or if they were, yet they are not commanded by God, and might be borrowed from the *Pagan-Idolaters*, (as *Bishop Andrews* proves they were) That the name *Baali* was used lawfully, and yet might not be used, when it had been used in idolatrous service.

Our consciences further say, That things of necessary use, (whether the necessity arose from nature, or from a divine Law) ought to be retained, though abused to *Idolatry*. (The question is not about them.) They only tell us, that it is sin to us to use *Modes, Forms, Methods* of divine Worship, which *Idolaters* have used, there being no such necessity of them, either from Nature, or any divine precept; and such *Rites, Gestures, Ceremonies*, as are not commanded from the Law of Nature, nor from any Divine Laws, but have been used by *Idolaters*, and distinguished their superstitious worshippings of God, from the worship of the true Churches of Christ.

XIV. In fine. We dread the sin of *Idolatry*; it is the principale \* In any di-  
peccatum Generis humani, saith *Tertullian*, we dread any kind of con-  
formity (not necessary) to *Idolatry*. \* We believe the *Papists* such, or in modes of  
And we cannot but judge, that if we should in our worshipping of worship.  
God conform to their *Modes* and *Forms*, and *Rites*, we should be  
more guilty of sin, then those *Mechanicks*, that make *Statues, Images, Crucifixes, Agnus Dei* for them; (all whom yet *Tertullian*  
would have concluded guilty.) And we cannot but admire; that any

any who pretend to reverence the *Fathers*, to take their dictates, should think light of this Argument; what would *Tertullian* have said to this? who would not endure *Bays* and *Ivy* at Christians gates; and who determineth all arts, professions, trades which are exercised, in making any *Statues*, *Images*, *Idols*, and any thing for their use and service to be, upon this account, defiled. We judge not others in this thing, let not them judge us; we shall conclude this with that fore-mentioned passage of *Tertul.* *O melior fides Nationum in sectam suam, quæ nullam solennitatem Christianorum sibi vendicat, non Dominicum diem, non Pentecosten; etiam si nossent nobiscum non communicassent, timerent enim, ne Christiani viderentur. Nos ne Ethnici pronunciemur non veremur.* Let the Reader for *Nationum* and *Ethnici*, put in *Pontificorum* and *Pontificii*; and for *Christiani*, *Protestantes*; and see what sense it will make: we are assured, the *Papists* would be more true to their Religion, then to borrow from us, *Rites*, *Vestments*, *Modes*, or *Forms of Worship*, or any thing of that nature. But enough is said upon this Theme.

Suppl. 3.

We remember, that in the plea for our selves, as to our forbearance of using the *Common Prayer Book*, we urged the scandal, which we are assured, that our using of it would give to tender conscientious *Christians*. We are not ignorant how much this plea is derided by some, and therefore shall take a little further liberty here to make it good.

1. We cannot without some trembling weigh those many Scriptures, by which God hath secured both the *lives* and *souls* of our brethren from our injuries. Upon this account it was that the *Israelites* were not to build an house without battlements, *Deu.* 22. Nor to leave a pit uncovered. *Exod.* 21. 33. Nor to put a stumbling stone before the blind, *Lev.* 19. 14. And as in reason the soul is more precious then the body, so the wise God hath proportionably forbidden us to do any thing, in our own nature indifferent, by which the souls of our brethren may be endangered by sinning against God. This is the main business of a Christian; of more value by far, then the asserting of his own liberty, *Rom.* 14. 13. He must judge this rather, that no man lay a stumbling block, or offence before his brother; no man must seek his own, but the good of others, *1 Cor.* 10. 24. We must give no offence, &c. *ibid.* Our liberty must not be used to the scandal of the weak, *1 Cor.* 8. 9. If our brother be offended, or grieved with our meat, we do not walk charitably, we must not destroy him with our meat, for whom Christ died, *Rom.* 14. 15. We must not for our meat destroy the work of God, *vers.* 20. It is a good thing,

neither

neither to eat flesh, nor to do any thing at which our brother should stumble, or be offended, or made weak: Saint paul, 1 Cor. 8. 13. resolved never to eat flesh while he lived, rather then to offend his weak brother.

2. We are not ignorant what is said to take off the edge of this Argument; we are told first; *That these precepts only concern us, where the command of our Superior, doth not make the thing necessary.* 2. *That divers are scandalized, because of our not conforming.* 3. *That all our liberty will be taken away, if we hearken to our peoples humours;* there being nothing we can wear or do, at which some or other will not take offence.

3. But we would, as to the first thing, gladly know, whether those precepts of the Apostle, be not reducible to the *Moral Law*? and whether the *Magistrate* be not as much obliged not to command things indifferent, where such a scandal will arise, as the inferior not to do them? We suppose that our brethren will not say, that the *Magistrates* command, can justify any soul in violating the express Law of God. And as they themselves would not interpret the Law of God thus, *Thou shalt not steal*, i.e. except thy Superior command thee; or, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, i.e. unless thou be so commanded: so they must pardon us if we cannot so interpret the Law of God in the case of Scandal. We humbly conceive that the Magistrate himself is by the Law of God restrained from commanding any thing by which weak Christians may be stumbled, offended, or made weak.

4. The true notion of a scandalous action, (in the sense we are now speaking to it) is, *Any action done by us, not being required by the divine Law, by which our brother, whether from the nature and condition of the thing done, or the intention of him that doth it, or both, is made to sin against God:* It is true, there are a generation of men whom the doing of our duty will make to blaspheme; but our duty doth not *ex conditione operis*, lay any such stumbling block before them. This is what *Aquinas* calls *Scandalum Phariseorum*, which our Saviour hath taught us to condemn. But to make a true Scandal, that which we do must be of that nature, as may give a cause of stumbling to our brethren; and this cannot be otherwise then in our ill use of our liberty, as to things of their own nature indifferent, but not appearing so unto all. For if the thing done by us, appear to our brethren a thing indifferent, there can be no Scandal. It is but a teachy humour in any to be offended at us, for any thing which they grant we may lawfully do; nor can they by our practise in such things

be

be possibly made to sin *ex conditione operis*. But where a thing appears to us in its own nature indifferent to be done, doth not appear so to other conscientious Christians, (which was the case amongst the Christians at Rome and Corinth) here we conceive our selves obliged to restrain our own liberty out of Charity to our brethrens souls. And as we conceive it our duty in practice to do so, so we conceive it the duty of *Superiors* to restrain their (supposed) liberty in commanding; the reason is, because the liberty of a *Magistrate*, or a *private Christian*, is of far less value, then a soul for which Christ died.

5. Now our Brethren may be made to sin by our practice in such things, many wayes. 1. *When our action causeth them to vilifie, censure, and condemn us, and to withdraw themselves from communion with us.* 2. *When our example draws on them to do the like, while their conscience is not satisfied, which is the very case mentioned in 1 Cor. 8. 10.* 'Tis their sin to do it, (not fully perswaded in their own mind) 'tis our sin by our example to intice them to it. Take heed least by any means that liberty of yours, becomes a stumbling block to them that are weak; for if any man see thee, who hast knowledge, sit at meat in the Idols Temple, (shall not the conscience of him which is weak, be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to Idols? This is plainly our case. Supposing that we were fully satisfied, that it were lawfull for us to use an imposed form, and that it were no restraining in us the gifts of the holy Spirit, no prejudice to our intencion of mind, nor to the fervency of our affection, nor to the afflictions of such as hear us, nor any yielding in that liberty, as to the worshipping of God, with which Christ hath made us free, nor any addition to the rule of Worship, which God hath set us in his Word, and that (notwithstanding it be confessed that these or those Modes, Forms and Methods, have been used by Idolaters) yet we may lawfully enough use them, yet we plainly see that they are so abhorred of many conscientious Christians, that as those who have returned to the use of them, have almost ruined their Ministry, by making themselves the scorn of some, and the grief of others; so should we do the like, some would for it vilifie and censure us, and condemn us, and separate from communion with us. Now suppose this would be their sin; yet the thing being (suppose) in its own nature indifferent, we have learned out of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 8. 12. *That when we sin against our brethren, and wound their weak consciences, we sin against Christ.* And far be it from us to gratifie men by sinning against Christ.



6. Again, whereas the Bishop of Exeter supposeth, *That our example would do much to bring over our people, to hear, &c.* We do ingenuously profess, that we believe it would prevail with some, who would at the present, seeing us (who they think have knowledge) use those *Modes of Worship*, (though with some reluctancy) be imboldened in their consciences, to come and hear (it's no more then the Apostle supposeth, 1 Cor. 8. 10.) but as they in doing of it should sin, so we by setting them an example; should directly act against the Apostles precepts, and lay stumbling blocks before them; and when they have done it, the tempter may Triumph over them, and we be found too weak to relieve their consciences, telling them, *That so follow us they have sinned against their light*, and the rebukes of their own consciences.

7. Besides, though it be apparent that those Scriptures which mention the precepts against scandal, take notice of *weak brethren* 1 Cor. 8. 12, 10 Rom. 14. 20, & V. 15. only, such for whom Christ died, such in whom is some work of God, which we must not destroy. And indeed in reason, these are chiefly to be considered, For the end of the precept is to save the hazard of the soul of our Brethren, by sin; now there are a generation in the world, whose constant course is a course of presumptuous sinning, they drink, they swear, they curse, they blaspheme, they wallow in beastly lusts, they will not be stoppt in a full career for hell, (whose offence we are not so concerned to regard) yet even to the worst of men, we conceive ourselves so far obliged by the law of Charity, as not wilfully, by our example to *harden them in sin*, and make them *justify themselves*. We are fully convinced, that there is nothing of more tendency to confirm the *Papists* in their way of worship, (which we believe Idolatrous) then for them to see us keep much the same; nor are we alone in this opinion, *Tertullian* of old, and after him *Augustine*, were both of the same mind: *Tertullian* forbids Christians any of the *Pagan usages*, or coming nigh to any of their devotions, that if they would not be ashamed of their *superstitions*, they might yet be ashamed of the *thin company* that attended them. *Augustine* crys out, *Quaritis quomodo vincantur Pagani describe eorum ritus.* We know how much some *Papist*-foreigners have triumphed, *distining* at the doors of some places where they have heard Service read and sung, crying out, *this is the same with theirs.* And not to insist upon the *Papists* only, we have many (called *Protestants*) whom we believe most grievously to sin in their use of our *Common-prayer*, (be it never so lawful in it self) they believe, that their very repeating over the words of those prayers) because as

V. Dr. Sparrow  
Ret. orale. p. 10.

Ibid. p. 8, 9.

they fancy) made by the Church, is devotion enough; they are taught that 'tis no matter for the *Vice* or *Virtue* of the persons praying, the prayers are the *Prayers of the Church*, and are acceptable to God; yea; 'tis no matter whether they be asleep or awake; present or absent, (if they have any just cause) nay more then this, they believe no prayers but these of any value, but abominations to God; they are taught so also. The publick worship of God prescribed by those to whom he hath given commission (the Author should have done well to have told us who they are, and to have proved it) is the only true and right publick worship, and all other forms, and methods offered up, instead of that though never so exactly drawn, (and put up with never so much faith and fervency too, he should have said) are strange worship, because not commanded. Now away with all such Atheistical Doctrine! according to which all prayer before and after Sermons is strange worship; the fervent effectual prayer of the righteous, which Salomon saith) is Gods delight; and S. James saith, availeth much, is strange worship? Is not this strange doctrine? yet verily we find many people of this faith, for which is not a title of Scripture, or sound reason; and is it not time that this *Brazen Serpent* should be *Nehushtan*? should we that are Ministers of Christ, do any thing to please men, to countenance such gross conceits, such odious and abominable opinions in the hearts of people?

8. Whereas we are told that we offend many others, yea, and those our Superiors too, because we do not do it. We answer we are not willing to offend any, much less our Superiors; but if we be brought to this strait, That we must either offend God or Men; the choice is not difficult. We do humbly conceive, that by enticing, or by our example encouraging others to sin, or by hardning any in sinfull opinions, or courses, we should highly offend God, we are told so by his word; God knows our hearts, it is a grievous Election to us, when we are by the law of God forc'd to chuse that part in practice, which shall offend our Prince, or any Magistrates, but our souls are dear unto us; and in preserving our own and other souls, we hope our gracious Sovereign will not be offended.

9. However we wonder that our brethren, who sometimes profess to so high an honour of St. Augustine, do not discharge us upon his credit, for we find him thus speaking:

Aug. de Verb.  
Dom. Sc. 6.

*Sed timeo inquires, ne offendam Majorem, time proptus, ne offendas majorem, & non offendes Deum. Quid enim times ne offendas Majorem? vide ne forsitan maior sit isto quam times offendere? Majorem certe noli offendere. — Quis est inquit major eo qui me genuit; An ille qui*

teipsum creavit? — Ille qui te vidit ut faceret antequam esset, quem fecit, certe major est patre tuo. — And again, Qui enim resisti potestati Dei ordinationi resistis, sed quid si illud jubeat quod non debes facere? — Timendo potestatem ipsos humanarum rerum gradus advertite. Si aliquid jusserit Curator none faciendum est? tamen si contra Proconsul jubeat, at non utique contemnis protestatem sed eligis majori servire, nec hinc debes minor irasci, si major praelata est. Rursum si aliquid ipse proconsul jubeat, & aliud jubeat Imperator, numquid dubitatur, in illo contempni illi esse serviendum? Ergo si aliud Imperator, & aliud Deus, quid judicatis? Solve tributum: est mihi in obsequio, Recte! sed non in idolo. In idolo prohibet, quis prohibet? Major potestas Dei. Veniam. Tu Cancrum, ille Gehennam minatur. We presume our Brethren will grant this; but they will tell us it is not sinful to use the Liturgy. That is the question, nor do we absolutely assert it; we only say we so apprehend it, we have given our reasons. And while we thus judge, we humbly conceive our forbearance is our duty. For suppose our consciences mistaken, yet our Brethren will grant that even an erroneous conscience, will, and ought to rye our hands, and oblige us *ad non faciendum contra*, (nor is this an error in matter of faith, if it be an error) we are not stubborn against conviction, our ears are open, we desire satisfaction; and certainly it is not for nothing that we are content, by such refusal, to put our selves out of hopes of preferment, and into the number of *sheep marked out for the slaughter*, if a Gracious Sovereign, and an Honourable Parliament, doth not look with a more favourable aspect towards us, then some others do. But the will of the Lord be done. — *Hic assumenda est fides nostra, tanquam Scutum* (saith *Augustin*) *loc. præd.*

10. Again offending is taken in a double sense, we are said to offend others, when we only displease them, and make them angry. 2. When we lay a stumbling block before them, and make them sin. We acknowledge it our duty to avoid the first, (if it may be) as to our meanest Brethren, much more to our Superiors. But if the case be stated thus, here is a thing required to be done; if you do not it, the Magistrate will be offended through anger; if you do it, many private Christians will be either *hardened in sin*, or *tempted to sin* by your example. What have we to do in this case? but to beg of our Superiors to be merciful to us; if in this thing we cannot harken to them, being ready in all lawfull things to yield them utmost *active obedience*: and here also a quiet passive *obedience*. And that this is our case is evident to all that will not stop their ears, and shut their eyes.

11. It is true, we do hear some whispering, that by this we lay also a *stumbling block* before our Fathers the civil Magistrates, and the Bishops, yea and many of our Brethren, who by our not using the said *Modes & Forms of Worship*, are ready to judge us *disloyal, disobedient to Authority*, and we tempt them to draw out the *civill sword against us*, &c. Now if indeed we do acknowledge *Magistracy*, and are (as we profess) ready to yield obedience, those who otherwise judge of us, *sin against God*; and those who shall punish us as *disloyal* (we being not so) also *sin against God*; But by this *non-conformity*, they tell us, we gave Superiors just so to censure us, and so to deal with us.

12. But to this objection the answer is not difficult, for we suppose that all sober Divines are agreed in this principle, *Si de veritate scandalum sumatur, nullis rasci permittitur scandalum; quam quod veritas relinquatur*; it was an old determination, no man ought to commit any thing against the precepts of God, for fear of making others sin if he doth not commit it. Charity in this case certainly begins at home, we must not by *sin* destroy our own souls out of charity, to prevent the destruction of the *work of God* in the souls of others. *Proximus ipse sibi*. It is a good thing for us to keep our souls from sin, and good things scandalize none but evil hearts, (saith Tertullian) Nor must our Brethren be scandalized, because we will not gratifie them with the use of our liberty, as well as others, whom they judge inferiour to them in *knowledge, wisdom, worldly skil, &c.* we can appeal to God that our hearts are sincerely troubled, when we hear of any single person in our Parishes scandalized, for our omissions in the case, provided they be such as are guilty of no prophane-ness in their lives, (the offence of open prophane and debauched drunkards, swearers, cursers, blasphemers, unclean persons, doth not so much trouble us) & we dare not say but that there are some such, (though they be not the fortieth part of those that are zealous against us in this case but what shall we, what can we do in the case for these good and sober Brethren?

13. Whiles we judge the thing in it self not lawfull, we cannot do it let who will be offended, and that will be granted by all; and we have found some of our Brethren, who wish we would do it, yet so ingenuous, as to beseech us, not for their sakes to wound our consciences. But suppose we did think it in it self and in all circumstances indifferent, that we might, or might not do it, we profess we should still be at a loss as the case stands, for these of our Brethren (whom we love and honour) how to gratifie them We. (suppose it) think the

*Ecce res neminem scandalizant nisi malum mentem.* Tert. de vel. Virg. c. 3.

the thing indifferent, it may be two, or three, or ten of our brethren think it so too, and for *uniformity* desire we would do it, possibly twenty, thirty, forty others of our people, whom we see walking close with God; they think it unlawfull, and with tears beseech us not to do it. They are not *humorously* offended, but they tell us, why they think it unlawfull, *They cannot bring their hearts up to be equally affected with a read prayer, as with one spoken from the immediate dictates of the heart; they cannot think it lawfull for us to use Modes of worship formerly used in an idolatrous service; they cannot judge it lawfull for the Magistrate to command any part (in a thing indifferent, in the worship of God) which manifestly is scandalous to any considerable number of sober Christians; they think the Law of God concerning scandalizing the weak, concerns Magistrates, as well as others; and that it is of the same nature with any other Moral Law, not to be superseded by any humane power.* What shall we do in this case? Doubtless in all reason if it appear to us but *indifferent*, we are bound to obtain by virtue of the command of God. And our brethren, who would have us do the thing, (if they acknowledge the thing indifferent) must yield to their weaker brethren, who are tied up from yielding to them, because they think the thing unlawfull.

14. The sum is this, God hath commanded us (in things as to *their own nature*, indifferent relating to his worship) to do nothing by which our brother may be grieved, *stumbled*, or made weak. The matter for the omission of which, the Bishop of Exeter so severely censurcth us, is a thing in its own nature (at best) but *indifferent*; we plainly see, that should we hearken to our *Diocesan*, divers for whom (our consciences tells us) Christ died, would be *stumbled*, *offended*, and *made weak*. We conceive, That the Law of scandal concerns the *Magistrate*, as well as the *Subject*: and therefore supposing a command in that case (which yet we see not) we humbly conceive our selves obliged not to disobey the Commands of the great God of Heaven and Earth. *Aquinas* saith, that *Propter scandalum etiam bona spiritualia, sunt pro tempore, occultanda vel differenda*. And *Hierom.* of old determined, *Dimittendum propter scandalum omne quod potest pratermitti salva triplici Veritate Vita, Justitia Doctrina*.

15. We conclude, that we judge our brethren very uneven in their censuring of us for disobedience to *Laws*, in this case of the *common-Prayer*, when they do the same thing themselves, for which they so charge us, singing *Anthemes* and *Songs*. &c. and using *Rites* and



and *Form* of prayer in *Cathedrals*, expressly contrary to the Statute, 1 *Eliz.* 2. and whiles the present *Vice-chan.* of Cambridge, without any Law of England, or Statute of the university, or Canon, or any colour of Law, and expressly contrary to his *Majesties Declaration*, and contrary to all conscience and reason, could dispense with his conscience, in usurping an arbitrary power, to the open prejudice of so many of His *Majesties Subjects*, in their children to stop fifty Commencements from commencing, because at 24. hours warning they could not find in their consciences to subscribe to the lawfulness of the *Common-Prayer*, and the book of *Consecration*, and to the 39 *Articles*, which none can with a good conscience subscribe, but he who hath distinctly read over the Book of *Common-Prayer*, and the Book of *Consecration*, who hath distinctly read over both the *Books of Homilies*, and is well studied in the point of *Ceremonies*, (how else shall he own *Art.* 34.) and in the controversy of *Church-Government*, v. *art.* 36. yea and indeed in the whole body of *Divinity*; which none can presume of boyes of 18 and 19. years of age, nay how many *Bachelors* and *Doctors* in *Divinity* never read them? ) yet all these must the *Questionists* subscribe and be forced to do it by the arbitrary power of the *Vice-Chancellor*, expressly contrary to His *Majesties Declaration*, (what authority he hath since procured as to the future, and by what acts we know not, but we are sure, when he did this, he had no such.) Yet Godly Ministers that dare not read the *Liturgie*, must be by these men whispered, as the only men that are disobedient to the Law; and upon that account giving just scandal to *Magistrates*, and opposing their *Authority*. But there is a God that judgeth the earth, to whose decision we humbly leave this matter in question, singing the 43 *Psalm*.

---

FINIS.

